

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, M.A., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*
Prof. A. G. CLARK, Litt.D., F.R.S., *Hon. Treasurer.*
Prof. R. E. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.R.S., *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.*
L. WHIBLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*
J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D., F.R.S., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*
J. BELL, M.A., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;

Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;

Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXIX NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1925 Nos. 7, 8

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE GENEALOGY OF ARETE AND ALKINOOS (9 54 ff.). A. SHEWAN	145
ON ΑΙΔΩΣ IN HESIOD. T. A. SINCLAIR ..	147
ON AESCHYLUS, <i>Agamemnon</i> , 1148. M. PLATNAUER	148
THEOCRITA. M. PLATNAUER	149
SOPHOCLES, <i>Antigone</i> 909 ff. JOHN MAVROGORDATO	151
NOTES ON THE ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. A. W. GOMME	152
ΔΙΑΚΡΙΟΙ and HYPERAKΡΙΟΙ. P. N. URE ..	155
NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> . H. RACKHAM	157
LYDIAN WORDS in the <i>Anthology</i> and HESYCHIUS. A. H. SAYCE	159
THE DEVELOPMENT OF PLAUTINE ANAPAESTICS. E. V. ARNOLD	160
OVID, <i>Metamorphosis</i> , viii. 16. D. A. SLATER	160
THE PURE IAMBIC TRIMETER. J. P. POSTGATE	161
QUINTILIAN, THE GOSPELS AND CHRISTIANITY. F. H. COLESON	166
SOME 'PROGRAMME' COIN-TYPES OF ANTONINUS PIUS. JOCELYN TOYNBEE	170
THE MOTHER GODDESS. A. D. NOCK ..	173
VARIA. H. J. ROSE	175
Αδρυός and Λογυόνης. W. RHYS ROBERTS ..	176
Callimachus, <i>Epig.</i> XXI. GILBERT A. DAVIES	176

REVIEWS:

Aristotle's Metaphysics (W. D. ROSS), WERNER JAEGER; *Euripides*, III., IV. (Léon Parmentier et Henri Grégoire), A. C. PEARSON; *Anthologia Lyrica* (E. Diehl), T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS; *The Religious Thought of the Greeks* (Clifford Herschel Moore), *A History of Greek Religion* (Martin P. Nilsson), W. R. HALLIDAY; *Five Stages of Greek Religion* (Gilbert Murray), W. R. HALLIDAY; *Platonism and its Influence* (A. E. Taylor), F. M. CORNFORD; *Introduction à*

REVIEWS (continued):

	PAGE
<i>l'Étude critique du Nom propre grec</i> (C. Autran), J. FRASER; <i>Menander</i> (U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf), D. S. ROBERTSON; <i>Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos</i> (U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf), E. A. BARBER; <i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i> (Johannes U. Powell), A. D. KNOX; <i>Lucian</i> (A. M. Harmon), A. S. OWEN; <i>Sappho and Her Influence</i> (David M. Robinson), J. M. EDMONDS; <i>Greek Themes in Modern Musical Settings</i> (Albert A. Stanley), <i>The Lyric Portions of Iphigenia in Aulis and Iphigenia among the Taurians</i> (Jane Peets Newhall), J. T. SHEPPARD; <i>A Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek</i> (J. P. Postgate), E. H. STURTEVANT; <i>Die Geographie des Ptolemaeus</i> (Otto Cuntz), J. O. THOMSON; <i>The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable</i> (Mary A. Grant), T. CALLANDER; <i>Plautus</i> (K. Kunst), J. S. PHILLIMORE; <i>Die Geschichte des Termzitates im Altertum</i> (Günther Jachmann), J. S. PHILLIMORE; <i>Lukres von der Natur</i> (Hermann Diels), <i>Lucretius, De Rerum Natura</i> (W. H. D. Rouse), J. D. DUFF; <i>M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri</i> (W. Heraeus), A. E. HOUSMAN; <i>A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's 'Letters'</i> (Edward Kennard Rand), W. B. ANDERSON; <i>Étude sur la poésie funéraire romaine d'après les inscriptions</i> (Édouard Galletier), W. B. ANDERSON; <i>Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres</i> (E. Diehl), A. D. NOCK	176-206
SHORT REVIEWS	207-212
CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY	212
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	213
CORRESPONDENCE	213
BOOKS RECEIVED	214
INDEX	216

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price for Double Numbers, 3s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Prof. H. A. Ormerod, 46, Cliff Road, Hyde Park, Leeds; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford, and Mr. C. T. Seltman, Queens' College, Cambridge; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. S. K. Johnson, Hulme Hall, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. M. M. Gillies, The University, Liverpool; Mr. A. D. Whitehorn, High School, Nottingham; Mr. R. W. Jackson, Cotham Secondary School, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss C. E. Parker, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. W. E. Nash-Williams, University College, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss E. L. Topham, Firth Park Secondary School, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. R. Wakefield, Girls' Grammar School, Maidstone; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gausson, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. A. B. Jeffries, 10, Denzil Road, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; and Mr. C. W. Baty, 40, Waterloo Road, Bedford.

SMITH COLLEGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

No. 6. Catullus in English Poetry

(Imitations, Translations, Reminiscences of Catullus facing the Latin text)

By ELEANOR SHIPLEY DUCKETT, Ph.D., D.Lit.

In preparation

No. 7. Juno, A Study in Early Roman Religion

By EMILY LEDYARD SHIELDS, Ph.D.

EARLIER NUMBERS

1. "Hellenistic Influence on the Aeneid," by Eleanor Shipley Duckett.
2. "A Study in the Commerce of Latium," by Louise E. W. Adams.
3. "The Case-Construction after the Comparative in Pliny's Letters," by Gifford Foster Clark.
4. "Nicolaus of Damascus's Life of Augustus," by Clayton Morris Hall.
5. "Iphigenia at Aulis: Iphigenia among the Taurians," the lyric portions set to music, by Jane Peers Newhall.

Nos. 1-4, 6, 7, \$.75; No. 5, \$1.50.

Address orders to

Miss Mary Dunham, Librarian of Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

nd
pon
nal
to
ate

ual
5s.
ings
ical
ical
fore
must

the
eds;
ege,
the
son,
reet,
hite-
nool,
astle-
lash-
eds;
O. T.
llege,
r. S.
scent,
tcher,
rd.

y

ion

ifford

set to

Mass.

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1925

THE GENEALOGY OF ARETE AND ALKINOOS (η 54 ff.).

THIS is a much-discussed passage, and one of the leading cases on which the Traditional Book theory of the Homeric poems is based. See for a particularly positive statement Burrows, *The Discoveries in Crete*, 217 ff., and for a very slender one, Murray, *R.G.E.*,³ 125, but there are others in the works of opponents of the unity of the *Odyssey*.

The principal difficulty is in the use of *τοκήων* in 54. A minor one is *ἄκουρον* in 64. That word, it is said—in disregard of the explanatory addition, *μὴν οἶν παῖδα λιπόντα*—can only mean 'childless.' Thus Burrows, '*ἄκουρον* would naturally be without a *κούρη* as well as without a *κούρος*,' and one wonders how he could be sure of this. But it is unnecessary to enquire, for practically the same phraseology used by Herodotus (V. 48), *ἀπέθανε ἄπαις θυγατέρα μόνην λιπών*, seems conclusive on the point.

The lines 54 f. are *ἐκ δὲ τοκήων | τῶν αὐτῶν οἱ περ τέκον Ἀλκίνοον βασιλῆα*. The word *τοκήων* must, it is asserted, mean 'parents.' So the union of Arete and Alkinoos was incestuous, and is a piece of indecency which the expurgators omitted to expunge. Professor Murray's statement that 'the *Odyssey* is less rigorously cleaned up than the *Iliad*' is all that we have in explanation of the omission.

I suggest that Homer's *τοκήες* is not confined to parents, but may include grandparents. And first, some general considerations. The Scholiast on the passage says *τοκήων* there means *προγόνων*, adding very pertinently, *καὶ γὰρ τοὺς πατέρας ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων τάττουσι*. Scholiasts, I know, sometimes 'only babble,' but it is possible that some of them knew Greek well. Again, it will surely not be surprising to find that *τοκήες* has this extended meaning when we observe that *πατήρ*

and *τοκεύς* are practically synonyms, and that *πατέρες* can mean either 'fathers' or 'forefathers.' Ebeling gives *πατέρες* = *maiores* in three passages. And, further, we have a good parallel in Latin in the distinction between *maiores* ('all ancestors more remote than the grandparents'—Lewis and Short) and *parentes* ('of the generations immediately preceding the present'). Indeed, we have something of the kind in Greek. It is somewhat remarkable that, though *γόνος* and *γονή* are common enough in the poems, *γονεύς* does not occur. It appears first in Hesiod and *Hym. Cer.* But in later Greek it had just the extended meaning that I believe *τοκήες* had, for I find in Schrader's *Reallexikon*, s.v. 'Vorfahren,' the following quoted from Isaeus, *γονεῖς εἰσὶ μήτηρ καὶ πατήρ καὶ πάππος καὶ τήθη καὶ τούτων μήτηρ καὶ πατήρ*. If, then, *γονεῖς*, why not *τοκεῖς*? And surely Homer knew some word for grandparents. He uses *μητροπάτωρ*, and would know *πατροπάτωρ*, and he had, no doubt, a single word for 'grandmother.' But he has no word for 'grandparents,' unless it be *τοκήες*. And yet we must believe that grandparents were relatives of some importance. They must have had standing in a community in which there are traces of the Joint Family system of the Indo-Europeans. Laertes, for example, is in retreat in the *Odyssey*, but by no means on the shelf. In θ 554 it is said that *τοκήες* give a child his name; in τ 399 ff. there is a christening, and the naming is done by a grandfather. And some famous heroes had patronymics derived from that relative. And, yet again, I was astonished to find, when I consulted Schneidewin's *Vocabularium*, that the only word for 'ancestors' in the poems is *πατέρες*. The poet knows *πρόγονοι*, but uses it only once, of firstling lambs. *πατέρες* is used of forefathers, more or less remote. That

makes it possible, even likely, that there was another word, not so wide in its application, for grandparents or near ancestors, and this seems to have been *τοκῆς*.

But it will be said, as it has been said, you may search Homer through and you will never find that word used except for 'parents,' and that meaning it must have in *η*. I pass the fact that, in ten editions which I have consulted, all the editors accept what is said to be the exceptional sense, and will consider the word on its merits. But, first, I note a remarkable peculiarity about its occurrences, which are thirty-seven in number. The singular *never* occurs, and the dual only *once*, with *δύω* added. In the other thirty-six places we have the plural. If *τοκεύς* can have but one meaning, it seems extraordinary that it should never be used of one parent.

But let us examine the passages. In the formula, six times repeated, *πόθι τοι πόλις ἤδὲ τοκῆς*; it is far from certain that 'parents' is the proper translation. If it were *δῶμος ἤδὲ τοκῆς*, there would be little doubt, but with *πόλις* an extended significance to the forebears from whom a man derives seems more appropriate. Just so in *πατρίδος ἤδὲ τοκῆων*, *ι* 34, on which it may be observed that, if Odysseus is referring to parents, they cannot be his own, for he knew his mother was no more. In *δ* 596 *τοκῆων* certainly cannot mean 'father and mother.' As Merry and Riddell note, the word 'is used loosely to express mother and grandsire,' and they add without a qualm, 'compare the use of *τοκῆων* of the ancestors of Arete and Alkinoos.' In *δ* 62 ff. again (Menelaos to Telemachos and Peisistratos), *οὐ γὰρ σφῶν γε γένος ἀπόλωλε τοκῆων*, either sense is admissible, and so in *Τ* 203 ff., *ἴδμεν δ' ἀλλήλων γενεήν, ἴδμεν δὲ τοκῆας*. In fact, 'ancestors' seems preferable on Leaf's explanation *ad loc.* of *πρόκλυτα* in 204. It would be interesting to know what precisely Homer meant by *τοκεῦσιν* in *δ* 689 after *πατρῶν* in 687, and whether he had Zeus in his mind with Leda in *Γ* 140, Thetis with Peleus in *Χ* 338, and the (by Homer) unnamed mother of Penelope in *τ* 158. And there are other passages in which there may be a

doubt. In fact there are only a few, such as *ξ* 50 of Nausicaa, *ἔν' ἀγγείλει τοκεῦσι*, where we can say with absolute certainty that 'parents' is the only possible rendering.

Even if the usage in question were quite unique, it would be rash to reject it forthwith. Singularities in the poems are, as Ludwich has observed, 'in thousands.' And there is a noticeable latitude in the use of Homeric words denoting relationship. The occurrences of *γαμβρός*, *γρωτός*, *ννός* and even *γυνή*, *κασίγνητος* and *ἀδελφεός* may be studied in the dictionaries. *γένος* is used, according to Ebeling, in six senses, and *γενεή* in five, some of them occurring only once or twice. *γόνος* can be used of a son or of a great-grandson, *κοῦρος* of any male from the child in the womb to the full-grown man. The uses of *τόκος* are *partus* 2, *proles* 2, *origo* 1. Those of *τίκτω* are very various, from 'conceive' up to 'produce' or 'be the progenitor of.' With *ξείδαρος ἄρουρα* or *γλανκὴ θάλασσα* as subject, it is used in the most general sense, more general even than in line 55 of our passage. We may compare *μητέρα μήλων* or *θηρῶν*.

Arete marries her uncle, as Tyro did, and as Diomedes and Iphidamas married their aunts. Marriage law or custom was less strict than it became later. Terpstra (*Antiquitas Homerica*, 104) goes so far as to say, *nulla fere consanguinitatis ratio habebatur*, and that only the union between parent and child was banned, referring to *λ* 271 ff.

A point is made in discussions of this matter of the fact that, according to a scholiast, Hesiod 'understood' Arete and Alkinoos to be brother and sister, but surely a possible and simple explanation of that is that he took Homer's *τοκῆων* to mean parents, and for that he may be forgiven.

Professor Burrows says, 'Nothing is more certain than that the passage represents the combination of two competing versions.' The combination was very badly done, that is all. And yet the combiner or expurgator or dialektist could have left all clear by the simple change of *ἐκ δὲ τοκῆων* to *ἐκ προγόνων δέ*.

A. SHEWAN.

ON ΑΙΔΩΣ IN HESIOD.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT's *Greek Lexicon* does not cite any instances of αἰδώς in Hesiod—a defect not remedied in the new edition. Yet *Erga* 317-319 is a *locus classicus* for the meaning of this untranslatable word. It is true that *Erga* 317 is nearly identical with *Od.* XVII. 347, and *Erga* 318 with *Il.* XXIV. 45; but these passages are not mentioned either. There is no mention of αἰδώς οὐκ ἀγαθή, nor does the classification given in L. and S. seem readily to admit this meaning. I propose to make a rapid survey of the places where αἰδώς occurs in Hesiod, distributing the various meanings as far as possible according to the classification of L. and S. (new edition), and then to discuss the unclassified residue.

The following is a summary of the classification of L. and S.:

- I. 1. As a moral feeling, respect for others' feelings or one's own conscience, self-respect.
2. Regard for the person of others, reverence, deference, and other meanings according to context.
- II. 1. That which causes shame or respect, a shame, a scandal.
2. = τὰ αἰδοῖα.
3. Dignity, majesty.
- III. Personified Αἰδώς; Reverence, Mercy.

In the *Theogony* αἰδώς only occurs in line 92:

ἐρχόμενον δ' ἀνὰ δαίτυ θεὸν ὡς ἱλάσκονται
αἰδοῖ μειλιχίῃ,

where it has the meaning 'reverence,'

I. 2. In the *Shield* 354:

ἐς Κήρυκα ἄνακτα· ὁ γὰρ δυνάμει τε καὶ αἰδοῖ
Τρηχίνος προβέβηκε,

'For he surpasses Trachis in power and majesty,' not 'honour' as in the Loeb translation. This use (II. 3) is only found here and in *Hom. Hymn to Demeter* 214. In the *Works and Days* the word occurs more frequently:

(1) δίκη δ' ἐν χειρὶ, καὶ αἰδώς
οὐκ ἔσται.

Erga 192-193.

'Right shall be in might, and there shall be no restraint.' Sittl here explains αἰδώς by σωφροσύνη, perhaps

recalling Thuc. I. 84, αἰδώς σωφροσύνης πλείστον μετέχει. And certainly αἰδώς is here used in a very wide sense, embracing all that is implied in I. 1 and I. 2. It is that feeling of compunction which keeps a man back from doing wrong—Plato's δεσπότις τις αἰδώς.

(2) ἀθανάτων μετὰ φύλον ἔτον προλιπόντ' ἀνθρώπων
Αἰδώς καὶ Νέμεσις.

Erga 199-200.

Personification (III.): cp. Pindar, *Ol.* VII. 45, where Reverence is made the daughter of Wisdom.

(3) εἴτ' ἂν δὴ κέρως νόον ἐξαπατήσῃ
ἀνθρώπων, αἰδὼ δέ τ' ἀναιδείῃ κατοπάσῃ.
Erga 323-324.

The sense (I.) is similar to that in I. 192 above.

So far the classification has not been difficult, nor do any of the above passages call for any special comment in a general lexicon; but there remain the three occurrences mentioned above. *Erga* 317-319:

αἰδώς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχρημένον ἀνδρα κομίζει,
αἰδώς ἢ τ' ἀνδρας μέγα σίνεταί ἡδ' ὀνίνησιν,
αἰδώς τοι πρὸς ἀνολίβη, θάρσος δέ πρὸς ὀλβῳ.

We are not here concerned with the question whether Hesiod wrote the first two lines or borrowed them from Homer; but the probability is that the lines are older than either Homer or Hesiod, and were commonly quoted as proverbs. What concerns us is to reconcile these slighting references to αἰδώς with the high conception of the virtue which we have seen so clearly marked in other passages in the poem, especially *Erga* 192-193 and 323-324.

That the poet himself felt the discrepancy is clear from the fact that he explains his meaning by adding οὐκ ἀγαθὴ; but what is more significant is that this feeling, though οὐκ ἀγαθὴ, is still called αἰδώς, and must ultimately be traced to the same feeling as the good αἰδώς. This I hope presently to do; but it is perhaps necessary first to rid our minds of the common explanation of αἰδώς οὐκ ἀγαθὴ as 'false shame,'¹

¹ See Goettling-Flach, third edition, and the note in this passage. Gladstone, *Studies on Homer* II., p. 431 ff., also translates 'false shame,' which may well be a possible translation in some cases, but not here.

which one is at first disposed to accept because of *ἐλπίς οὐκ ἀγαθή*, 'false hope,' in line 500. Now false hope is hope based on false or insufficient grounds; similarly false shame is shame that is based on wrong notions. But the shame of the penniless man is not based on wrong notions; he has a very good reason to be ashamed of himself in Hesiod's eyes. The idea that a poor man has nothing to be ashamed of, and is really as good as other people, is quite foreign to Hesiod; but this is the impression that the translation 'false shame' gives. I do not think Hesiod can possibly have intended his hearers to think that the evil shame that attends a poor man is false in any sense of the word. It is *οὐκ ἀγαθή* not because it is based on wrong notions, but because it makes a man feel uncomfortable and despised (see below).

Now *αἰδώς*, as we have seen, is the feeling of regard for one's own conscience or one's fellow-men which keeps

a man from doing anything that would offend either of these. But this feeling may be carried to excess, and then, instead of helping a man (*δύνησιν*), it does him harm (*μέγα σίνεται*), for it gives him an uncomfortable feeling of inferiority that makes him hesitate to act on his own initiative; and that is what happens to a man of no substance (*κεχρημένον ἄνδρα κομίζει*). Such a doctrine is thoroughly characteristic of Hesiod, and is again emphasised in the third of these lines, where it is opposed to the *θάρος* which a man of wealth has. This seems at least to be consistent with the general tone of Hesiod's teaching.

Finally, to return to our classification, we ought to add to the meanings under the first heading a third one (I. 3): *αἰδώς οὐκ ἀγαθή* . . . ἢ μέγα σίνεται only in Hes. *Op.* 317-319, 'a feeling of insignificance' caused by having an excess of *αἰδώς* I. 2.

T. A. SINCLAIR.

ON AESCHYLUS, *AGAMEMNON*, 1148.

1146-9.

ἰὼ λυγείας μόρον ἀηδόνος·
περίβαλον γὰρ οἱ πτεροφόρον δέμας
θεοὶ γλυκύν τ' αἶψα κλαυμάτων ἄτερ·
ἐμοὶ δὲ μῖμνει σχισμὸς ἀμφήκει δορί.

So the Oxford text, *αἰψα* being an alteration in M of the *ἀγῶνα* of the first hand of M—the reading of all the other MSS.

The chorus has just said, in effect, to Cassandra: 'Your lamentations remind us of the nightingale and her plaints for Itys.' They have said nothing about death. If *ἀγῶνα* in the sense of 'final agony' (so Verrall) is right (which I very much doubt—there are no real parallels), C. can only use it because of the double meaning of *μόρος*. Not 'oh, but to *die* as a musical nightingale' (Verrall); but 'oh, for the fate (= lot) of the nightingale'; then, as *μόρος* means also fate (= death), *ἀγῶνα*, etc. This interpretation certainly saves *κλαυμάτων ἄτερ*. 'The nightingale had a pleasant, tearless death; for me waits the *σχισμός*.' But if, as is far more probable, we read *αἰψα*, *κλαυμάτων ἄτερ* is in the highest degree awkward. The usual interpretation is 'a sweet life

without tears.' Now not only has the chorus two lines above spoken of the nightingale as *ἀκόρετος βοᾶς*, but it would be scarcely an exaggeration to say that no Greek poet could mention the nightingale without referring to her *κλαυμάτα*. Yet some editors are content with this.

Headlam explains *ἄτερ* as 'except for.' No other instance, I believe, is known of *ἄτερ* in this sense, though of course *ἀνευ* is so used in prose. But could anything be less like poetry? 'The gods gave her a sweet life if you discount her tears.'

Wecklein took Weil's bold emendation *διαί*. I would suggest that Aeschylus may have written:

αἰψα κλαυμάτων· ἀτὰρ
ἐμοὶ γε

. . . 'gave a sweet life of tears: while for me . . .'

The instinct which led the scribe to expect the sentence to run on to the end of the line, coupled with failure to understand the oxymoron, might cause *ἄτερ* for *ἀτὰρ*. γε would then be changed to δέ to get the connexion.

M. PLATNAUER.

THEOCRITEA.

III. 28-30:

ἐγνων πρᾶν, ὅκα μιν μεμναμένω εἰ φιλέεις με,
οὐδὲ τὸ τηλέφιλον ποτεμάξατο τὸ πλατάγημα,
ἀλλ' αὖτως ἀπαλῶ ποτὶ πάχεος ἐξεμαράνθη.

THIS passage would not have given so much trouble to editors had not a scholiast with a dangerously small amount of knowledge poisoned the source of exegesis: τηλέφιλον . . . ἀναλαμβάνεται παρὰ τῶν ἐρώντων τὸ τ., καὶ πληττόμενον εἰ ψόφον ἀπετέλει, ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς σημειοῦσθαι, ὅτι ἀντερώνται ὑπὸ τῶν ἐρωμένων.

Now that *one* method of discovering the sentiments of the ἐρωμένη was to smack the poppy (or anemone) leaf against the arm and see whether it crackled is no doubt true. It is indeed confirmed by Pollux (9. 127): εἰ κτύπον ποιήσειεν εὐκροτον ὑποσχισθὲν τῇ πληγῇ τὸ φύλλον (i.e. τὸ τηλέφιλον), μεμνήσθαι τοὺς ἐρωμένους αὐτῶν ὑπελάμβανον. But in this passage any interpretation based on 'crackling' is out of the question, for none of the words means that. προσμάσσειν means properly to stick or plaster one thing on another. Failing to get the right sense in ποτεμάξατο, some editors (Meineke, Briggs, Wordsworth), again misled by a scholiast, have accepted the *varia lectio* πλατάγησεν, turning ποτεμάξατο into ποτιμαζάμενον or ποτιμαζαμένω (Meineke). But, unfortunately, πλαταγεῖν does not mean to crackle; it means to slap or clap. Further, it is nonsense to say that the leaf did not 'crackle,' but 'withered' (ἐξεμαράνθη); the right antithesis would be 'made no noise.'

As to πλατάγημα, it ought to mean 'a slapping' (cf. πλατάσσω), though a scholiast equates it with the concrete πλαταγώνιον, i.e. the smacked leaf (ἔστι δὲ τὸ μήκωνος φύλλον). A good parallel to this is afforded by A.P. 6. 220. 15, where λαλάγημα is used of Cybele's drum. Hence the modern view (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Cholmeley) that τὸ πλ. is in apposition to τὸ τηλ.: 'the Love-in-absence, the slapping leaf, did not stick on.' This gives good sense, but it saddles ποτεμάξατο with a very odd intransitive meaning.

This is, however, better than the alternative, accepted apparently by Mr.

Edmonds in his Loeb edition, of taking τὸ πλ. as an abstract accusative: 'nor did the Love-in-absence stick on <at> the smacking,' which is very questionable Greek.

I would suggest that it is easier to take τὸ πλ. as an abstract *subject* with τὸ τηλ. as object: 'nor did the smacking stick on (i.e. cause to stick on) the Love-in-absence, but it, the Love-in-absence, just withered.'

The abstract subject is unusual, but quite possible: cf. Dem. XIX. 260.

VI. 6, 7:

Βάλλει τοι Πολύφαμε τὸ ποίμνιον ἃ Γαλάτεια
μάλισιν, δυσέρωτα τὸν αἰπόλον ἄνδρα καλεῖσα.

The general sense of this passage is clear. Galatea throws apples at Polyphemus' flock of sheep (ποίμνιον) to call Polyphemus' attention and win his love. But what of δυσέρωτα . . . καλεῖσα?

Paley and Briggs 'calling the goatherd (i.e. Polyphemus) hard-hearted.' This is at least grammar; but (i.) Polyphemus was a shepherd, not a goatherd; (ii.) δύσερος should mean 'perdite amans,' not 'unloving.' The scholiast saw difficulty (i.) and offered two explanations: (a) That Theocritus uses the word καταχρηστικῶς, i.e. by an abuse of language. This at least is honest. But why didn't Theocritus write ποιμένα? He could presumably have made it scan. (β) That, as Homer (ι 184) says, the Cyclops possessed μῆλ', οἷός τε καὶ αἰγες. This, in face of ποίμνιον of l. 6 and οἶων of l. 10, is absurd.

Cholmeley takes τὸν αἰπ. as a predicate, 'calling you laggard-in-love, the goatherd.' For the article with the predicate he cites the hopelessly corrupt 22. 69; and though such a construction is found (e.g. Aeschin. 2. 167 τὸν καλὸν στρατιώτην ἐμὲ ὠνόμασαν), it is surely impossible here, where δυσέρωτα, also a predicate, has no article. Nor is the sense what we want for reasons given above. Fritzsche tries to meet this difficulty by taking the words ironically, 'calling you madly in love and' (he reads καὶ for τὸν) 'goatherd'—'ad bilem Polyphemi movendam eiusque amorem excitandum.' It is hard to see why

they should do either. To compare I. 86 and say that αἰπόλος 'cum contemptu dictum est' is to miss the point of I. 86. Meineke remarks 'non suspectarem haec, si verba τὸν αἰπόλον de alio quam de Polyphemo intellegi posset.' Surely they can. The αἰπόλος is *not* Polyphemus, but a previous lover whom Galatea wishes to give up in favour of Polyphemus. She calls (=refers to) 'the goatherd fellow' an over-eager (*i.e.* a tiresome) lover. This interpretation seems to me to have three advantages: (i.) It clears up the αἰπόλος trouble. (ii.) It gives the right meaning to δύσεως, viz. the meaning of 'taking love too hardly.' Liddell and Scott give this meaning, citing Thucydides, Lysias, Euripides, 'and often in the *Anthology*.' For this presumed second meaning of 'hard-hearted' they quote only this passage and Call. *Ep.* 42. 6, where δύσεως certainly means 'passionately in love.' (iii.) It gives point to I. 17, where it is said of Galatea that

καὶ φεύγει φιλέοντα καὶ οὐ φιλέοντα διώκει.

The first half of this line is meaningless unless Galatea scorns an importunate lover. It may be that for τὸν we should read ἑόν or ὄν, 'her <formerly loved> goatherd fellow.'

XIII. 52:

κουφότερ' ὃ παῖδες ποιεῖσθ' ὅπλα· πνευστικός οὖρος.

K. Call. πνευστικός.

Shooting stars are a sign of coming wind. 'Make the ? more ? There's a sailing (or a squally) wind.' Again the troubles of editors are attributable to an erroneous scholium: ἐκλυτα καὶ εὐτρεπῇ ποιεῖτε τὰ ἱστία. ἐκλυτα καὶ εὐτρεπῇ certainly. That is the right meaning of κουφός—light, nimble, easily manipulated. But ἱστία = sails and ὅπλα = ropes; and between these two things there is a difference. 'It is a well-known fact,' says Stevenson in *Aes Triplex*, 'that an immense proportion of boat accidents would never happen if people held the sheet in their hands instead of making it fast; and yet, unless it be some martinet of a professional mariner or some landsman with shattered nerves, every one of God's creatures makes it fast.' And this is just what the ναῦται in question had done—made fast the sheet. They

are told to make it loose in view of the coming wind. Personally I think Theocritus wrote πνευστικός; but it is immaterial.

XIII. 69, 70:

ἱστία δ' ἡμίθεοι μεσονύκτιον ἐξεκάθαιρον
'Ηρακλῆα μένοντες.

As Cholmeley says, there is no need to suspect ἐξεκάθαιρον = they cleared away. The sense is, 'they cleared away the sails at midnight (μεσονύκτιον, cf. 24. 11), having waited till then for Heracles' return <and then given him up>.' But this requires an aorist, not a present, participle. Query, read 'Ηρακλῆ μέιναντες or, even more likely, 'Ηρακλέα (for this form with synizesis in Theocritus cf. 24. 1). 'Ηρακλέα might easily be altered to the more normal 'Ηρακλῆα, and μέιναντες altered to μένοντες to scan.

XXIV. 11, 12:

ἄμος δὲ στρέφεται μεσονύκτιον ἐς δύσιν ἄρκτος
'Ωρίωνα κατ' αὐτὸν . . .

'But when the Bear turns to his midnight setting over against Orion himself . . .'

Surely αὐτὸν is here intolerably weak.

Query, read 'Ωρίωνα κατ' ἄντα or ἀντί(α) or 'Ωρίωνι καταντί(α).

(The αὐτὸν ἐπ' 'Ωρίωνα of Aratus, *Phaen.* 730, proves nothing.)

XXIV. 42-45:

δαίδαλεον δ' ὥρμασε μετὰ ξίφος, δ' οἱ ὑπερθεῖν
κλιντήρος κεδρίνου περὶ πασσάλῳ αἰὲν ἄωρον.
ἦτοι δγ' ὠρεγνῶτο νεοκλώστον τελαμώνος,
κουφίζων ἑτέρᾳ κολεόν.

Amphitryon going to the rescue of the infant Heracles attacked by the snakes.

No editor so far has taken offence at I. 44. Yet it may be argued (i.) that an anxious father in a hurry to save his baby would content himself with a sword and not bother about his Sam Browne, so to speak; (ii.) that ἦτοι ὄγε can only be used where there is a change of subject, as in 22. 95; (iii.) that ἑτέρᾳ presupposes two, not three, actions ('he dashed for his sword <with one hand>, taking off [not "taking up," as Mr. Edmonds translates it] the scabbard with his other'); (iv.) that the poem is elsewhere suspect for interpolations—e.g. I. 51, which B omits, and II. 86, 87, which Fritzsche and Mr. Edmonds

rightly eject as echoes of the second chapter of Isaiah.

Omit l. 44 and all is plain sailing.

XXIV. 80:

ἀπὸ στέρνων πλατὺς ἦρως.

If in 14. 68 ἀπὸ κροτάφων does not mean 'judging by the temples,' certainly in 16. 49 ἀπὸ χροιάς means 'judging by the complexion,' so there can be no hesitation in taking ἀπὸ στέρνων here as 'judging from his chest.'

But can one say 'a broad hero, judging from his chest'? Have we not here rather the slang use of πλατὺς = downright; as found in Ar. *Ach.* 1126, κατὰ γελως πλατὺς?

Erig. VIII., ll. 5, 6:

Ἡτίωνι χάριν γλαφυρᾶς χερὸς ἄκρον ὑποστάς
μισθόν.

Editors (and Liddell and Scott) take this as 'having promised a tip-top price to Eetion as a reward for his skilled hand.'

No doubt γλαφυρός might be used in an active sense; but the only instances cited in Liddell and Scott (besides the present passage) are those in Aristotle, *hist. an.*, where the epithet is applied to spiders. But as in IX. 38. 1 these spiders are called γλαφυρώτατοι καὶ λαγαρώτατοι (lanky), I suspect γλαφυ-

ρώτατοι of meaning no more than 'smooth,' 'not hairy.'

Now Pollux (II. 150) says Πολυκλεί-
του χεῖρ τὸ ἀγαλμα, καὶ Ἀπελλοῦ χεῖρ
ἢ γραφή, showing that χεῖρ can have
the same meaning in Greek as 'manus'
in Latin—viz. work of art.

Translate, therefore, 'for his carefully
wrought statue.'

XXI. 50, 51:

εἴθ' ὑπομινάσκων τῷ τρώματος ἡρέμα νύξα
καὶ νύξας ἐχάλαξα καὶ οὐ φεύγοντος ἔτεινα.

Musurus' φεύγοντος for MSS. φεύ-
γοντες, and Briggs' νύξας ἐχάλαξα for
MSS. νύξαι χαλέξας, are certain emen-
dations. But what does καὶ οὐ φεύ-
γοντος ἔτεινα mean? Kiessling (quoted
by Briggs and Hiller-Fritzsche) 'cum
non fugeret, intendi scil. τὸν κάλαμον.'
Mr. Edmonds, 'showed him the butt.'
But why do this? Another suggestion
of Briggs is ἔτεινα = 'eduxi,' I drew him
(the fish) out of the water, landed him.
This, I imagine, is impossible Greek.

Now τείνειν πόδα is normal Greek for
keeping the sheet taut, and in Soph.
Ant. 916 the verb is used alone, πόδα
being understood.

This is the meaning we want here,
and the meaning which gives the cor-
rect antithesis to ἐχάλαξα: 'I slackened
<the line>, and when he did not bolt
I tightened <it>.'

M. PLATNAUER.

SOPHOCLES, *ANTIGONE* 909 FF.

πόσις μὲν ἂν μοι κατθανόντος ἄλλος ᾔην,
καὶ παῖς ἀπ' ἄλλου φωτός, εἰ τοῦδ' ἡμπλακόν,
μητρὸς δ' ἐν' Αἰδοῦ καὶ πατρὸς κεκενθόταιν
οὐκ ἔστ' ἀδελφὸς ὅστις ἂν βλάστωι ποτέ.

I BELIEVE the once famous difficulty
in the *Antigone* has been settled by this
time: I mean that no one now contends
that these lines must be spurious because
unworthy of the character of a Victorian
heroine, or because inconsistent with
reasons which Antigone has given in a
previous passage. Most readers would
now accept without dispute the con-
clusion of Professor Gilbert Norwood
(*Greek Tragedy*, p. 139) that 'the "diffi-
culty" exists only in the minds of
those who attribute inconsistency in a
character to incompetence in a play-
wright.'

It may, however, be worth while to note

a curious parallel to Antigone's senti-
ments found in one of the Cretan ver-
sions of a modern Greek folksong. This
well-known ballad of 'The Man who
loved his Brother's Wife; or, the Wicked
Sister-in-Law,' is found in widely vary-
ing versions all over the Greek world.
The best recension of it is that given
by Polites in his *Ἐκλογαὶ ἀπὸ τὰ τρα-
γούδια τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Λαοῦ* (No. 80),
although some picturesque touches are
added by the longer version in Passow
(466).

The younger of two devoted brothers
has long loved his brother's wife, but
has not dared to tell her. When at
last on a holiday he meets her in a
quiet lane and finds courage to speak,
she not only jumps at the declaration,
but urges him to go and murder his

brother; and suggests that it will be easy to pick a quarrel if he insists on dividing up, and dividing with flagrant injustice, the land which they have hitherto held and worked together. The younger brother follows her advice and proposes the unjust division. But when everything he proposes, instead of being resented, is cordially accepted by the elder brother, who begs him to take the lot rather than that they should quarrel or part, he is shamed by such generosity, and turns aside and weeps. Then he rides quickly home and calls to his sister-in-law to bring water to wash his sword. She runs downstairs in such a hurry (this is a good touch) that she snatches up the jug although it is full of wine instead of water. And he slays her.

That is the complete artistically developed story. But in a rather fragmentary version from Crete (Kriares, *Κρητικά ἄσματα*, p. 330, 'Η κακή γυναίκα καὶ ἡ ἀδελφικὴ ἀγάπη) the hero, when

told to murder his brother, merely remarks:

Σὰ χάσω 'γὼ τὸν ἀδερφὸ μπλεῖ μ' ἀδερφὸ δὲν κάνω,
σὰ χάσω τὴν κονιάδα μου πάλι κονιάδα κάνω . . .

'If I lose my brother I cannot make a brother any more; if I lose my sister-in-law I can get a sister-in-law again.' The ballad breaks off at this point, leaving the fate of the woman to be inferred. In another fragmentary version from Chios (Kanellakes, *Χιακὰ Ἀνάλεκτα*, No. 46) the hero is even briefer in his argument:

ἐγ' ἀδελφὸν δὲν κάνω πιά, μὰ νόφη κάνω κι' ἄλλη . . .

and cuts off her head!

A Scottish ballad heroine, Lady Margaret in *The Douglas Tragedy*, uses an argument superficially similar to that of Antigone in circumstances that are entirely different:

'True lovers I can get many an ane,
But a father I can never get mair.'

JOHN MAVROGORDATO.

NOTES ON THE ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

4. 2 ἤρουντο δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐννέα ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς ταμίαις οὐσίαν κεκτημένους οὐκ ἐλάττω δέκα μινῶν ἐλευθέρων, τὰς δ' ἄλλας ἀρχὰς <τὰς> ἐλάττους ἐκ τῶν ὅπλα παρεχομένων, στρατηγούς δὲ καὶ ἱππάρχους οὐσίαν ἀποφαίνοντας οὐκ ἐλάττων ἢ ἑκατὸν μινῶν ἐλευθέρων.

THIS passage, as Kaibel noted, would certainly have been clearer if Aristotle had written ἤρουντο δὲ τὰς μὲν ἄλλας ἀρχὰς ἐκ τ. ὅ. π., τοὺς δ' ἐννέα ἄρχοντας . . ., στρατηγούς δὲ κτλ.; particularly in view of κληροῦσθαι δὲ καὶ ταύτην καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς below, where 'the other offices' are presumably 'the lesser ones.' But we should get an equal gain by a smaller change if we read τὰς δ' ἄλλας ἀρχὰς <τὰς μὲν> ἐλάττους κτλ. (with, of course, the necessary alteration of δέκα μινῶν to some figure larger than 100 minae—Wilamowitz, I. 79-80).

8. 1 τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς ἐποίησε κληρωτάς ἐκ προκρίτων, οὓς ἐκάστη προκρίνει τῶν φυλῶν. προκρίνεν δ' εἰς τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας ἐκάστη δέκα, καὶ <ἐκ> τούτων ἐκλήρουν. ὅθεν ἐτι διαμένει ταῖς φυλαῖς τὸ δέκα κληροῦν ἐκάστην, εἴτ' ἐκ τούτων κυμαίνων. σημεῖον δ' ὅτι κληρωτάς ἐποίησεν ἐκ τῶν τιμημάτων ὁ περὶ τῶν ταμιῶν νόμος, ὃ χρώμενοι διατελοῦσιν ἐτι καὶ νῦν. κελεύει γὰρ κληροῦν τοὺς ταμίαις ἐκ πεντακοσιομεδίωνων.

Adcock (*Klio*, 1912, pp. 6-7) points out that this account of the manner of election of the archons is in opposition

to the general tradition of the fourth century (represented also by the *Politics*) that the archons were elected by vote; and he goes on: 'the κλήρωσις ἀρχόντων is clearly an inference from the ταμίαις law. . . . Aristotle uses the ταμίαις law, which he believes to be Solonian, as evidence, because there was no surviving law on the archonship: for had such a law survived how is the general tradition that the archons were αἰρετοί to be explained?' But he misses the true meaning of the inference by mistaking the emphasis. This is not on κληρωτάς, but on ἐκ τῶν τιμημάτων and ἐκ πεντακοσιομεδίωνων; and the inference is used to illustrate the statement in 7. 3 that only the three highest classes were eligible for office, and only the highest of all to the most important offices (which included that of ταμίαις).¹ Hence Aristotle does not use the law on the archonship; for that office in his day was open to ἵππεις and ζευγῖται as well. Sandys rightly understands the inference in the first part of his

¹ So Kenyon, in his translation (1920).

note on this passage, and mistakes it in the second.

Similarly in the other inference here, ὅθεν ἔτι διαμένει ταῖς φυλαῖς τὸ δέκα κληροῦν ἐκάστην, εἴτ' ἐκ τούτων κναμεύειν, it is not simply 'the intervention of the tribes' which 'is the point of contact between the two methods' (Sandys), but the number of preliminary candidates chosen: though the number of phylae had increased from four to ten the number of candidates chosen from each remained the same. It may be noted that in this case Aristotle himself contradicts his inference; for before the introduction of the lot and the double election in 487 'all the archons were elected by vote' (22. 5). The reform of 487 may have been a revival of a Solonian institution; but that institution did not remain in force till Aristotle's day.¹

12. 5 ὅσοι δὲ μέλουν καὶ βίαν ἀμεινονες
αἰνοῖεν ἂν με καὶ φίλον ποιοῖατο·

εἰ γὰρ τις ἄλλος, φησί, ταύτης τιμῆς ἐτυχεν,
οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον οὐδ' ἐπαύσατο,
πρὶν ἀνταράξας πῖαρ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα.
ἐγὼ δὲ τούτων ὥσπερ ἐν μεταίχμῳ
ὅρος κατέστην.

Take the last line and a half first. They are supposed to mean 'I set myself up as a boundary stone in between the two opposing armies.' 'As a boundary stone' must mean that Solon took up a position so as to be fought over by both parties, the natural fate of boundaries (εἵλετο πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους ἀπεχθέσθαι). But this is unsatisfactory. Aristides' summary (II. 360 Dind.) is as follows: ἐκείνος μέντοι παρὸν αὐτῷ στασιαζούσης τῆς πόλεως ὁποτέρων βούλοιτο προστάντι τυραννεῖν, ἀπεχθά-

¹ It is wrong to say (with Lehmann-Haupt, *Klio*, VI. 304 ff.) that all Solon's regulations involving election ἐκ προκρίτων were necessarily cancelled when the phylae were raised from four to ten, and that in consequence Aristotle could not have inferred the Solonian archonship law from that in force in his own day. The *tamias* law, he says, survived because there was direct election to this office, without *πρόκρισις*; Cleisthenes raised the number of *tamiai* from four to ten, thus leaving the wording of the law unchanged—τοὺς *tamias* κληροῦν ἓνα ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς ἐκ πεντακοσιομεδίωνων. Still more easily could the wording of a law involving *πρόκρισις* remain unchanged when the number of magistrates remained the same: τοὺς ἐννέα ἀρχοντας κληροῦν ἐκ προκριθέντων ὑπὸ τῆς φυλῆς ἐκάστης δέκα.

νεσθαι μᾶλλον ἀμφοτέροις εἵλετο ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικαίου, καὶ τῶν μὲν πλουσίων ὅσον καλῶς εἶχεν ἀφεῖλε, τῷ δῆμῳ δ' οὐκ ἔδωκεν ὅσον ἐβούλετο, ἔστη δ' ἐν μεθορίῳ πάντων ἀνδρείοτατα καὶ δικαιοτάτα, ὥσπερ τινὰς ὡς ἄληθῶς ἐκ γεωμετρίας περιγραπτὸς φυλάττων ὄρους. (Unless Solon, as is possible, repeated himself, Aristides must here be summarising more than one poem, for he is referring to verses summarised by Aristotle in II. 2, to the elegiac verses given in II. 1, and to those now before us.) Aristides was capable, if anyone was, of expanding some one else's ideas into many words; but in summarising he does not, as far as my knowledge goes, introduce ideas of his own.² It is therefore probable that a line has been lost after *μεταιχμῶ*, in which the word ἔστην (or κατέστην) occurred and also some words corresponding to ὡς ἄληθῶς ἐκ γεωμετρίας περιγραπτὸς (and perhaps another line corresponding to πάντων ἀνδρείοτατα καὶ δικαιοτάτα), and that in the next line we should read ὄρους φυλάσσων. The meaning will then be: 'I prevented the popular party from overrunning and destroying the nobles, by guarding the boundaries which I had carefully and justly drawn between them.'

As to the much discussed previous line, Platt (*Journ. of Phil.* XXIV. 1896, p. 248 ff.) pointed out the difficulties in the way of Sandys' 'before he had stirred up the milk and got out the cream' (the order of the words, and the fact that you do not get cream by stirring up the milk; to which we may add that ἐξεῖλετο would be required, as in *Il.* XI. 550, βοῶν ἐκ πῖαρ ἐλέσθαι), and also objected, rightly, that Solon is

² For this reason I doubt whether the passage in *Or.* XXIV. 14 (Keil), ἐκείνος τοίνυν ἐν τοῖς ἐλεγείοις διεξῶν περὶ τῶν αὐτῶ πεπολιτευμένων ἐπὶ τούτῳ μάλιστα πάντων σεμνύνεται, τῷ καταμίξαι τὸν δῆμον πρὸς τοὺς δυνατοὺς, ὅπως ἂν μὴ γνώμη τὴν πόλιν οἰκώσιν, μηδέτεροι πλείον ἰσχυόντες ἢ κοινῇ συμφέρει, is a reference to the elegiacs in *Ath. Pol.* 12. 1, though it may be a summary of another part of the same poem. If I am right, then Aristides does not get all his knowledge of Solon from the *Ath. Pol.*, as Platt supposed, or we must assume a lacuna in the latter. The *v.l.* χρησμένων λέγοντας in Aristides for *χρειοὺς φηγόντας* in l. 11 of this poem (see Adam on *Rep.* VIII. 552D) also points in the same direction.

not here discussing the actions of a selfish man, but of a foolish one, who would have allied himself with the extreme left, whereas he, Solon, prevented the two parties from flying at each other's throats. Which objections (except the first) apply equally to Hude's 'bis er alles getrübt und den Rahm von der Milch geschöpft hätte (*ἐξαιρεῖν* mit der Konstruktion des *ἀφαιρέσθαι*); and no parallel is adduced for this use of *ἐξαιρεῖν*.

Platt therefore would keep *πῦαρ*, the reading of the papyrus (Plutarch has *πίαρ*), 'beestings,' the first milk from the cow after calving. 'It was considered a dainty by the Athenians. . . . And if it is stirred up the separation of this cream from the rest is effected more quickly. The milk left is valueless. If Solon then said, "before he had stirred up the beestings and got out all the milk," he talked very good sense. . . . If so, the phrase *ἐξεῖλεν γάλα* does not mean "had seized the tyranny," but simply "had carried the separation of the two elements to completion" . . . whereas a good legislator wants to keep them mixed together, justly tempering the elements in the state' (cf. Aristid. XXIV. 14, above). It is something to get a word which means a favourite and familiar Athenian dish; for I do not know that the Greeks ever made cream in the usual sense from milk, especially as the milk generally used was got not from cows but from goats. But we should want *ταράξας*, not *ἀνταράξας* (as in *ταράττειν φάρμακον*: so Kaibel, who compares Hippocr. VI. 112 L. *ὁ ἀὴρ παραχθεὶς ἀνταράξε τὸ αἷμα καὶ ἐμίγη*—he reads *πρὶν ἢ ταράξας*); we still have not the right meaning, for Solon is here congratulating himself not on mingling the elements, but on keeping them apart, preventing one side getting the better of the other; and, thirdly, would anyone have understood what Solon meant, when his main idea, separation, is so obscurely expressed? *πῦαρ* being a dainty, the natural meaning would be that a selfish man would have taken it for himself.

Linforth (*Solon the Athenian*, 1919, p. 193) has a further suggestion, that *πίαρ* means butter, 'the only kind of

fat which is obtained from milk by shaking.' He admits that this was practically unknown in Greece, but Herodotus (IV. 2) and Hippocrates (VII. 504 L.) describe the making of it by the Scythians; and the latter uses the word *ταράττειν* for the shaking of the wooden vessels containing the milk, and *τὸ πῖον* for the butter: *καὶ τὸ μὲν πῖον, δὲ βούτυρον καλέουσι, ἐπιπολῆς δύσσταται ἐλαφρὸν ὄν*. But apart from the fact that both Herodotus and Hippocrates are clearly describing a process which they take to be unknown in Greece, there is this further difficulty, that butter-making, though a barbaric, was yet a blameless action, which is not what is here required; and we should still presumably have to take *ἀνταράξας* with *γάλα*.

If *πίαρ* is the cream of a thing, *τὸ κράτιστον*, as Hesychius says, *γάλα* must mean *τὸ ὅλον*, the milk before the cream is taken, not skim-milk, which must have been definitely expressed. Sir J. Simon, in a recent law-suit, said: 'They were the big three, and it was no part of his case that they were not swindling the little three. No doubt they were; they were taking the cream of this delicacy before they distributed the skim-milk.' That is perfectly clear, and Solon could have said as much had he wished. In this context *τὸ κράτιστον* ought to mean 'the best elements in the state,' the nobles, and the whole phrase would then mean 'having stirred up, confounded the nobles'; while *γάλα*, *τὸ ὅλον*, would be the state. The result of confounding the nobles, the ideal of any other *δήμου προστατης*, would have been the destruction of the state; Solon prevented the masses from attacking the nobles by taking his stand between them (or *πίαρ* may be an adjective, to be taken with *γάλα*: 'another would have destroyed the best of the milk'). For this we should certainly desire *ἐφθειρεν* for *ἐξεῖλεν*. I do not propose any such unjustified change, and must leave the passage as it is; but I believe this interpretation of the metaphor to be on the right lines.

A. W. GOMME.

(To be continued.)

DIAKRIOI AND HYPERAKRIOI.

In the February and March number of the *C.R.* (pp. 5-7), Mr. Casson has made to this problem a new contribution based on the habits of the modern Vlachs. He argues (1) that the Attic Diakrioi or Hyperakrioi did not include miners of the Laurium district, and (2) that all people so named were herdsmen.

Both conclusions run counter to the evidence. But as regards the second he has some suggestive remarks which deserve to be followed up. It is in the hope that he will do so that I venture to offer the following observations.

To clear the ground, I will begin with his criticisms of my own view that the Peisistratæan Diakrioi consisted largely of miners from Laurium. For convenience of reference I keep the numbers given by Mr. Casson to the four main heads of his criticism.

1. Mr. Casson seems to make a point of the fact that *ἄκρα* can be the home of hillmen. Nobody denies it. For instances besides those he gives, see *Origin of Tyranny*, pp. 41, 44.

As regards the prefixes *ὑπερ-* and *δια-*, Mr. Casson's remarks appear to me sound and useful. Hyperakrioi and Diakrioi (as also Epakrioi) are presumably synonyms meaning people dwelling on or spread over *ἄκρα*. This interpretation is fully applicable to the *Σουνιακὸς γουνός*, where I place the most important section of the supporters of Peisistratos (*O.T.*, pp. 40, 41). It does indeed contradict Palmerius (*O.T.*, p. 40), but the point of my quotation from that early scholar is not his explanation of *di-* and *hyper-* but the fact that he associates both Diakrioi and Hyperakrioi with Sunium.

2. 'The name *Διάκριοι* is not, as one might infer from Professor Ure's account, a term confined to Attica.' This is a surprising inference to draw from my account, which, though concerned only with Attica, reminds the reader (p. 41) that 'we are dealing with common nouns that were used by the Greeks with different connotations at different places,' and instances those very Diakrioi in Euboea and Rhodes

that Mr. Casson proceeds to quote against me.

'There were certainly no miners of precious metals either in Euboea or in Rhodes.' This comment of Mr. Casson's is relevant only if we delete the word 'precious,' and if we do that it ceases to be true. The Euboeans mined both copper and iron (*O.T.*, p. 37), and there were at least two mining districts in the island (near Chalkis and Aidepsos). Mr. Casson differentiates two communities of Euboean Diakrioi (one with the variant name Diakres). It may be rash to equate the two mining districts with the two Diakrian, but it is still more rash to quote the Euboean evidence as disproving my views. Rhodes too probably had mines both of iron and lead (Blümmner, *Technologie u. Terminologie*, IV., pp. 73, 89).

3. 'The contention that "there can be no question that the mines (of Laurium) were worked in the sixth century" (p. 47) is based admittedly on no evidence at all except negative evidence and upon the belief . . . that the Diakrioi were miners.' Nobody who reads the whole of pp. 46, 47 of my book will find any such admission. It is true that 'the mines do not appear in history till 484 B.C.' (p. 46). But our only modern expert on this question (Ardaillon, *Les Mines de Laurium*, pp. 132, 133) holds that the discovery of the rich veins worked in 484 implies centuries of previous prospecting and exploiting, and his conclusion is borne out by Plutarch, who says that the mines were yielding considerable revenues before 484, and still more by Xenophon, who says that they had been worked from times beyond record. Short of precise dates and facts the evidence could hardly be more positive. It is quite independent of my views on the Diakrioi. (Seltman, *Athens*, p. 39, n. 4, rightly recognises this fact.)

4. As regards the evidence of the Semacheion (the shrine located in the mining district by a recently found inscription), 'one Semacheion does not make a deme': but it goes a long way towards establishing the situation of

the Epakrian deme Semachidai. Where else should we expect a Semacheion? On the other hand, it is not surprising that some few members of a deme in the extreme south of Attica should have died while visiting Athens and been buried near the city. To regard the Semachidai tombstones found in Athens as something that can be set off against the unquestionable location of the Semacheion in the mining district (and incidentally in a trittys of the tribe to which Semachidai belonged) is scarcely doing justice to the evidence. The Plotheia tombstones found together in a country district are another matter, but there is nothing in this evidence for North Attic Diakrioi which 'invalidates the main theory of identification of Diakria near Laurium.' (See further *O.T.*, p. 41.) Can it be that when Mr. Casson wrote this final sentence he had already forgotten his own two separate communities of Diakrians in Euboea? My own suggestion (*O.T.*, p. 45, also overlooked by Mr. Casson), of two separate Diakriai in Attica itself, is perhaps even more to the point.

2. I have left to the last what according to Mr. Casson is my strongest argument, because it becomes so only if we accept his contentions on points 1, 3, and 4. I am not even sure that he is wrong in his contention that his 'scallywags' were Diakrioi only in a political sense, and not in an industrial. But neither am I sure that he is right. Plutarch's *θητικὸς ὄχλος* is obviously to be regarded as a large element in the Peisistratean Diakria, and as it is presumably singled out for mention either as the main or the most unexpected element, it is perhaps most naturally taken to be the former. How far it should be equated with the *Ath. Pol.* description of Peisistratos' party is another question. Mr. Casson rightly reprehends me for doing injustice to the word *προσεκεκόσμητο*, but the tense of the word leaves it possible to interpret Aristotle as making the 'scallywags' find employment among the Diakrioi before Peisistratos had raised

his stasis, and this interpretation is perhaps borne out by the fact that the pronoun is not *ταύτῃ* but *τούτοις*. In any case, we are dealing with only one element in the party (cp. *O.T.*, p. 49, 'partly of foreign extraction'; p. 307, 'largely not of pure race'). Mr. Casson tends to minimise this element. I, on the other hand, at any rate on p. 307, have erred in the other direction, and gladly take this opportunity of thanking him for drawing my attention to the fact. The error does not affect my main argument.

So much for Mr. Casson's destructive criticisms. They do not, I think, do enough towards establishing a dominant Vlach party in sixth-century Athens to make it necessary to point out the extreme difficulties involved in such a view (see *O.T.*, Appendix A). But I should be the last to deny that the Vlach analogy may some day help to explain evidence (not yet forthcoming¹) for Diakrian communities of herdsmen. The Welsh analogy that led me to begin collecting the evidence for an Attic mining Diakria offers some encouragement. 'Gwyr y mynyddau' (men of the mountains) means in South Wales 'miners.' In other parts its ordinary meaning is 'shepherds.' It is true that Attica, Euboea, and probably Rhodes too possessed mines. But it is not necessary to assume that either in Attica (see *O.T.*, p. 41), Euboea, or Rhodes the Diakrioi were more homogeneous than the 'gwyr y mynyddau' in Wales. Miletus, too, where there were apparently no mines (though possibly quarries, Blümner, *op. cit.*, III., p. 46), had its Hyperakria, and so presumably its Hyperakrioi (*O.T.*, p. 40, n. 8). As they appear to have escaped Mr. Casson's notice, I herewith commend them to his favourable consideration.

P. N. URE.

¹ In the *C.I.A.* the *Διακρίης ἀπὸ Χαλκιδίων* are repeatedly described as a *πόλις*, a description fatal to the Vlach view as at present formulated.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE NICOMACHEAN ETHICS.

1096a 18. ἐλέγομεν K^b, ἔλεγον vulg., edd. Perhaps λέγομεν, cf. 19 λέγεται: λέγομεν would be assimilated to the imperfects on either side of it, and ἐλέγομεν corrected to ἔλεγον. 'The great and indisputable merit of K^b is that it has so faithfully retained the errors and accidents of an older text' (Bywater, *Contributions*, p. 21).

1097a 17. Perhaps κὰν ταῖς λοιπαῖς. Apelt's omission of a comma after στρατηγικῇ is not convincing.

1097b 12. γονεῖς can hardly stand for 'ancestors' after 10 γονεῦσαι 'parents.' At 1100a 26, 30, it means 'ancestors' including parents, but in every other passage in the *Ethics* indexed by Bywater it means 'parents.' Rassow's γονεῖς <τῶν γονέων> is too asymmetrical unless we also add <τῶν τέκνων> to ἀπογόνους. Better correct γονεῖς to προγόνους. For words replaced through mere error by other words occurring in the context see Richards, *Aristotelica*, p. 74. Here προγόνους may have been miscopied ἀπογόνους (the writer's eye catching the ἀπογόνους that follows), and this corrected to γονεῖς.

1098b 4. Perhaps μετιέναι δὴ.

1107b 27. ὀρέγεσθαι <μικρὰς> τιμῆς; or possibly better ὀρέγεσθαι ταύτης, ousted by τιμῆς, a gloss. Cf. 1125b 1, where, however, καὶ περὶ ταύτην must mean not 'small honours,' but 'in relation to honour in general (as in relation to money) there seems to be a minor as well as a major virtue.' Ramsauer would there replace ταύτην by τιμὴν, but the mistake this assumes is not so likely as the converse error at 1107b 27.

1b. 29. ταύταις or τοιαύταις ὀρέξεσι seems required.

1108a 31 f. Transpose ἡ γὰρ—καὶ ὁ αἰδήμων to l. 35 after ὁ δὲ μέσος αἰδήμων. In 32 there should be a comma after ἐπαινεῖται δέ.

1112a 28 f. Transpose ἀλλ' οὐδὲ—βουλεύεται to l. 33 after ἀνθρώπου.

1114a 31. εἰ δὲ τις λέγοι ὅτι introduces a reported objection, which ends at b 12 εὐφρία, where there should be a comma (as Apelt) or colon. Aristotle's reply begins with εἰ δὴ ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ. In 10 καὶ τὸ (τὸ δ' L^bM^b) should be simply τὸ (Vermehren, Susemihl,

Richards); and in 11 τὸ before καλῶς should be omitted as in the quotation of the passage by Alexander of Aphrodisias (Susemihl).

1115a 23. φθόνον: Burnet's φόνον is surely right, and the passage he quotes against it from *E.E.* does not seem parallel.

1115b 11 f. This passage seems to be usually taken to mean that the brave man will fear even τὰ κατ' ἀνθρώπον φοβερά (καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, which are contrasted with τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων; this is παντὶ φοβερόν τῷ γε νοῦν ἔχοντι), but nevertheless will endure them when it is right to do so. But this is to attribute to the ἀνδρείος a sort of moral struggle resembling ἐγκράτεια in the sphere of σωφροσύνη. For Aristotle ἀνδρεία consists not in conquering fear, but in feeling and not feeling it rightly. Throughout the context φοβεῖσθαι is the opposite of ὑπομένειν, and means almost 'to flinch from' (as in Homer 'to be put to flight'). The ἀνδρείος φοβεῖται some φοβερά and ὑπομένει others. Susemihl rightly saw that φοβήσεται requires the qualification ὡς δεῖ δέ, and secured this by inserting τε between ὑπομενεῖ and τοῦ. It occurs to me that one might avoid the need for this by putting a comma or colon after ὡς δεῖ δέ, which will then qualify φοβήσεται alone, leaving the same qualification to be expressed with ὑπομενεῖ by the alternative phrase ὡς ὁ λόγος, which is then paraphrased, or strictly speaking modified, by τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα. However the words be exactly taken, τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα goes in sense with ὑπομενεῖ only, because φοβεῖσθαι, however right and proper on occasion, could hardly be felt to be καλόν.

1115b 28. Bracket περὶ τὰ φοβερά: it is περὶ τὰ θαρραλέα that ὁ θρασὺς ὑπερβάλλει, cf. 31 ἐν οἷς δύναται, 32 f. ἐν τούτοις () (τὰ φοβερά). Throughout, φοβερά are the objects of φοβεῖσθαι and ὑπομένειν, θαρραλέα ὁ θαρρεῖν (and presumably ἀποδειλιᾶν, though Aristotle does not use the word in this connexion).

1125a 21 f. Bracket καὶ ἀγνοεῖν δ' ἐαντὸν as a mistaken addition from l. 28 (commentators are divided whether to

take it as parallel to ἔχειν or to ἀγνοῦν, and Stewart records a variant ἀγνοεῖ). Self-ignorance is characteristic of the χαῦνος, who is ἡλίθιος, but not of the μικρόψυχος, who is not ἡλίθιος but only ὀκνηρός: he knows his own merits, but does not claim his deserts.

1134b 28. καίτοι: perhaps καὶ γὰρ.

1140a 5. διὸ must be wrong: that x is not part of y is not an inference from the fact that x is not the same as y . The variant καὶ L^bO^b is superfluous; probably οὐδὲ should stand alone. περιέχεται for the less well attested περιέχονται seems unlikely with ἔξως, ἔξως, so close on one side, and πρᾶξις, ποίησις, on the other.

1143a 19. Probably καθ' ἣν εὐγνώμονας (L^bI) καὶ ἔχειν φάμεν συγγνώμην (so Richards for MSS. γνώμην): cf. 30 εὐγνώμων explained by συγγνώμων.

1144a 21. Write πράττεσθαι <πράττειν>, cf. 1136b 8 f., or <τυγχάνειν>: cf. l. 25 and E.E. 1227b 39 (quoted by Stewart) τὸ μὲν οὖν τυγχάνειν τούτων ἀλλης δυνάμει ὅσα ἐνεκα τοῦ τέλους δεῖ πράττειν.

1148a 14. καὶ ἐγκρατὴ καὶ σώφρονα must either be taken parenthetically ('just as we group together the ἐγκρατὴς and the σώφρων'), or more probably, as they lack the article, bracketed. The context is concerned only with the ἀκρατὴς and the ἀκόλαστος.

1148b 23. δανείζειν: perhaps ἐρανίζειν.

1149a 13. Write ἔστι μὲν ἔχειν μὲν τινα ἐνίοτε μόνον (a copyist may be forgiven for shuffling a μὲν here!).

1153a 2. MSS. ἤδη χαίρουσιν, ἡδεῖ χαίρουσιν, χαίρουσιν ἡδεῖ: write χαίρουσιν alone, and <ἤδη> καθεστηκυίας in the next line.

1153a 6. οὐδ' <αἰ> ἡδοναί.

1156b 3. Perhaps φιλοῦσι <ταχέως> καὶ ταχέως παύονται.

1156b 22. K^b ταύτη γὰρ ὁμοῖοι καὶ τὰ λοιπά is sound. Ll. 19-22 run: 'There are five qualities which can serve as motives for friendship—viz. ἀγαθὸν ἀπλῶς, ἀγαθὸν τῷ φιλοῦντι, ἡδονὴ ἀπλῶς, ἡδονὴ τῷ φιλοῦντι, and ὁμοιότης τις. All five are present in ταύτη (i.e. τῇ τῶν ἀγαθῶν φιλίᾳ), and that (not κατὰ συμβεβηκός, but) καθ' αὐτούς; for ἀγαθοὶ φίλοι are ὁμοῖοι et cetera (viz. καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἡδεῖς καὶ ἀπλῶς καὶ τῷ

φιλοῦντι) ταύτη, "in that way," i.e. καθ' αὐτούς. (Therefore their friendship, being based on all the possible qualities, and those not accidentally present in them, but inherent in their nature, is permanent. Q.E.D.).' For τὰ λοιπά denoting the same four qualifications for friendship cf. *infra* 33 and 1162b 3; and for its doing duty for masculine adjectives predicate to (εἰσὶ) cf. 1127b 19 καὶ ἃ διαλαθεῖν ἔστι μὴ ὄντα, sc. τινὰ masculine (unless ἃ be there omitted with K^b). Burnet objects that Aristotle has not yet decided, and never actually decides, that all friendship is based on similarity. But hitherto he has inclined to this view, cf. 7 above, where κατ' ἀρετὴν ὁμοίων implies that other friends also have ὁμοιότητά τινα: and the above version does not quite commit him to it.

1158b 4. ὅτι δὲ ἡττόν (ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἡττόν L^b) εἰσιν αὗται φιλίαι καὶ μένουσιν: write either καὶ ἡττόν εἰσιν . . . καὶ <ἡττον> μένουσιν, or ἡττον καὶ εἰσιν . . . καὶ μένουσιν.

1161a 24. ἀγαθὸν looks like an erroneous gloss interpolated. In an unequal friendship the superior receives less good, but more love and honour, than the inferior. With πλέον understand φιλίας (or more accurately φιλήσεως), cf. l. 21 f. above.

1165a 11. οἴονται: write οἶεται, and (with M^bI) δόξειεν. The corruption of the latter to δόξαιεν led to οἴονται; but after ἔχει the two plurals seem impossible; we are dealing throughout with a single pair of people. Nor can οἴονται stand with δόξειεν and mean 'people in general think,' for that is not to the point.

1165b 21. For τῷ τοιούτῳ or τούτῳ ἡ (or ἣ) τοιούτῳ MSS., write ἣ τοιούτῳ. (Sussehl τούτῳ ἣ τοιούτῳ, but it should be αὐτῷ ἣ τοιούτῳ.)

1166a 25. καὶ <αἰ>.

1168a 21-27. As the text stands, τοῦτο l. 26 must be τὸ μᾶλλον εἰδέναι ὅτι αὐτῶν: but μᾶλλον than whom? For in the case of mothers it means more than fathers, not children. Even if it can mean that benefactors know whom they have benefited better than beneficiaries know who are their benefactors, this, though possibly true, is hardly a likely point to make here. It

seems preferable to treat *διὰ ταῦτα δὲ—γέννησις* as a parenthesis (which should come after *παρалаβόντων*), and *καὶ μάλλον ἴσασιν ὅτι αὐτῶν* (with Ramsauer and Susemihl) as an interpolation (an irrelevant note from 1161b 19, where the actual words apply to parents in contrast with children, though extended below to mothers in contrast with fathers). In l. 26 write *δὴ* (with Thurot) for *δὲ*, and *καὶ τοῦτο* for *τοῦτο* *καί*: 'This then also (viz. special affection for what has cost you trouble) would seem to be characteristic of benefactors'—it is yet another explanation of the thesis of the chapter, that bene-

factors love their beneficiaries more than the latter love the former.

1170b 4. [*συν*] *αἰσθανόμενοι*. Throughout the context *αἰσθάνεσθαι* expresses self-consciousness, (*10 συναισθάνεσθαι . . . τοῦ φίλου ὅτι ἔστιν*, sympathetic consciousness of one's friend).

1171a 35. Perhaps *αὐτῶν <ἡδονῇ> εἶναι*.

1172a 9. [*ἀβέβαιοι ὄντες*] an irrelevant note from 1159b 8.

1173a 19. [*τοὺς*] *ποιούς*.

1177a 5. Write *δὴ* for *δὲ*: the *ἐνέργεια τοῦ βελτίονος* is *σπουδαιοτέρα*, and *βελτίων* *οἱ κρείττων*, and *εὐδαιμονικωτέρα*. H. RACKHAM.

LYDIAN WORDS IN THE ANTHOLOGY AND HESYCHIUS.

I HAVE, I believe, three more words to add to the list of Lydian words already known. In the *Anthology* (VII. 709) is an epigram of Alexander the Aetolian upon Alcman, who was of Lydian origin, which begins:

*Σάρδιες ἀρχαῖαι, πατέρων νομός, εἰ μὲν ἐν ὑμῖν
ἐτρεφόμαν, κέρνας ἦν τις ἂν ἢ μακέλας
χρυσοφόρος, ῥήσσαν καλὰ τύμπενα.*

'*Αρχαῖαι* is a better reading than the variant *ἀρχαῖος*; *νομός*, however, can hardly be correct; *δόμος* or *πόλις* would have given a better sense. Instead of *κέρνας* Plutarch has *κελσας*. 'Αν ἢ is evidently right as against the corrupt *ἀνὴρ* of the MSS.; but *μακέλας* has been needlessly 'emended' into a non-existent *βακέλας*, and even the metrically impossible *βάκηλος*.

In *κέρνας* and *μακέλας* we must see two native Lydian words. *Κέρνας* is a derivative from *κέρνος*, a non-Hellenic word, which originally belonged to the worship and ritual of Kybelê, and must, therefore, have come from Asia Minor, like the offerings-dish which it denoted. In *μακέλας* we have the suffix which is so distinctive of Lydian grammar and vocabulary. 'Whether I were a *kernas* or a *makelas*' will therefore give us the names of two classes of priests connected with the cult of the mother-goddess at Sardes. Whether the epithet *χρυσο-*

φόρος applies to both of them or only to the *μακέλας* is doubtful, since vessels and other objects of gold were carried in procession in honour of Kybelê, while on the other hand the adjective would more naturally be interpreted in its customary sense of 'wearing gold.' Picard prefers the first interpretation; I should incline to the second. If *κέρνας* really denotes the *κέρνος*-bearer, *χρυσοφόρος* would more probably relate to the *μακέλας*. In any case it can scarcely have signified 'gold-bearing,' since the *κέρνας* would have had his hands full of the *κέρνοι* and the *μακέλας* was employed in beating the cymbals.

Another word which I think can be identified as Lydian is *κέρμηλος*, which is stated by Hesychius to signify 'copper-ore.' The Greeks derived their copper in early days from Asia Minor and Cyprus; the suffix of *κέρμηλος* is not Cypriote however, while we find it in *κάπηλος*, which we gather from Herodotus was of Lydian origin. Hence we may conclude that *κέρμηλος* also came from the same source.

A formation similar to *μακέλας* is *ἄμπελος*, the Asianic origin of which, like that of *οἶνον* and *κάροιον*, has long been recognised. Did it come to the Greeks from Lydia or from languages spoken further to the east?

A. H. SAYCE.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PLAUTINE ANAPAESTICS.

MR. W. B. SEDGWICK's article on the *Cantica* of Plautus (C.R. XXXIX. 55 ff.) opens up a promising line for metrical investigation. Although his proposals are only intended to be tentative, they appear to receive some confirmation from an enquiry in which I have been engaged as to Plautus' Anapaestics.

In Mr. Sedgwick's first period occur the consecutive Anapaestic Septenarii of the *Miles*, the only continuous passage in this metre. A close connexion with the Trochaic Septenarius is suggested by the frequency of diaeresis, not only at the end of the fourth foot, but also after the first, second, fifth, and sixth, and also by the preponderance of polysyllabic feet in the first and fifth places.

If we call the first and fuller half of the Septenarius A, and the second half B, then the Anapaestics of the *Miles* are of the type AB. But in Mr. Sedgwick's second period we find most commonly stanzas of the type AAAB, AAAAB, AAAAAAB, and in the third period the Octonarius (AA) dominates. This appears to be quite a natural development.

A point which deserves consideration is the scheme of the Anapaestic verse. According to tradition and the usage of other poets this admits only feet of four *morae*, viz., Anapaest, Spondee, Dactyl and perhaps Proceleusmatic. But if we scan the Anapaestics of Plautus in accordance with his usual practice we find in some 725 verses

between 200 and 300 feet which contain five *morae*, being either Bacchiacs or Cretics or resolved forms of these.

All the torture-engines of criticism have been used to get rid of these intruders. Most prominent is a violent extension of the principle of breviation. As Professor Lindsay says (*Early Latin Verse*, p. 296), 'the most devoted admirers of Plautus feel that there is an excessive use in his Anapaestics of the slurrings due to a Brevis Brevians.' Equally excessive is the alleged use of Synizesis. If neither of these methods succeeds, it is possible to deny that the verse in question, in spite of the company it keeps, is really Anapaestic. And even so there still remains an intractable residue: e.g., *Pseud.* 1321,

quid? hoc au- | ferēn', Pseu- | dole mi, aps tuo
ero : | lubentis- | simo cor- | de atque animo.

All these troubles disappear if we assume that Plautus conceded to himself in Anapaestics the same liberty which he claims (though by no means so freely) in Bacchiacs and Cretics, of permitting an additional *mora* to the foot. Plautus, we know, did not hesitate to modify the metres which he inherited; and it is more instructive to observe his practice than to theorise about his principles. Whether this particular development is due to the influence of the Bacchiac and Cretic metres seems to be a point deserving of further investigation on chronological lines.

E. V. ARNOLD.

OVID, *METAMORPHOSIS*, viii. 16.

Regia turris erat vocalibus addita muris,
in quibus auratam proles Letoia fertur
deposuisse lyram : saxo sonus teius inhaesit

HAS it never been suggested that 'eius' here is in all probability not a pronoun at all but a transliteration from the Greek of the epithet, the 'literary' epithet, for 'sonus,' which the context seems almost to demand? Just as in the parallel description of Megara in the *Ciris* the author of that poem (line 108) characterizes the weird music—

the θεῖος νόμος—as 'Cyllenia murmura,' so here Ovid has allowed himself a similar liberty and given to the strain an equally recondite epithet, but an epithet proper not to the instrument but to the player, Apollo Citharoedus.

'Whispering I know not what of wild and sweet,
Like that strange song I heard Apollo sing,
While Ilion like a mist rose into towers.'

Ovid's contemporaries would readily recall the phrase in the Homeric

ἐνθα σέ, ἦε Φοῖβε, θεαὶ λόον ὕδατι καλῶ,

¹ Cf. e.g. among the phrases found only in his works *αἰαί* at *Met.* x. 215; 'παρς ὕμναται ἀν-
των, παρς clamant ἑὺν ἐνοί' at *Am.* i. 563,
'αἰωνον in silvis idem pater αἰωνον altis,' etc.,
at *Am.* iii. 9. 23. See also at *Met.* xii. 110. The
proper names generally are so mishandled by
the scribes that no *app. crit.* can find room for
the corruptions they have suffered.

In Plautus the 'Palatine' MSS. make a pronoun, 'illas,' of 'Ilias' (A) at *M.G.* 743.³ Here we have no Ambrosian Palimpsest to restore the truth; but the *deteriores*, which not seldom elsewhere throw light on the dark places of the poem, by offering 'adhaesit' for 'inhaesit' and 'saxo sonus haesit in illo,' for 'saxo sonus eius inhaesit,' give us at any rate a pretty broad hint that the last word in the line is corrupt, and that the 'in' of 'inhaesit' is in fact (like the 'in' of line 146 below) 'a metrical stopgap' interpolated in the text at an early stage by a 'Greekless' scribe. Read therefore 'saxo sonus Eius haesit.'

² Burmann (1727) *ad loc.* cites one from Propertius iv. 6. 67, and one from Tibullus i. 6. 25; Ehwald two from the Elegiac poems of Ovid (*Trist.* iii. 4. 27, *Ex Pont.* iv. 15. 6), but Elegiacs are nearer to prose, and admit licences which are denied to the Hexameter.

³ At *Met.* xv. 804 the 'illa deum' of *Voss. Leidens. Q.* 61 (saec. xiii.) points to 'Iliaden' as the true reading there. Cf. *Class. Rev.* 27. 257.

IN the *Classical Quarterly* XVIII. (1924) 46-48 I examined the relations between word accent and metrical ictus in one homogeneous metre—the *Ionicus a Minore* of Horace. I here examine them in another—the Pure Iambic Trimeter of Catullus and others. The advantage of this particular study to an investigation of these relations in Latin verse as a whole is that the inquiry is not complicated by having to take account of alternatives. The metrical ictuses in all the words admissible into pure iambic lines must always fall on the same syllables. We cannot have such variants as $\acute{\text{a}}$ — and $-\acute{\text{a}}$ which dactyls and impure iambs admit.

Our material consists of seven complete poems: Catullus 4 and 29; the second Priapean piece ascribed to Tibullus, and printed at the end of the

Corpus Tibullianum in the editions of Baehrens, Hiller, and others; the second Priapean of the triad preceding the 'Vergilian' *Catalepton*; *Catalepton* 10, a parody of Catullus 4, and 6 and 12 in the same collection, all written in consecutive pure iambics; to which we may add the lines with even numbering in Horace, *Epode* 16. For these, by their definite place and function in a metrical scheme, are obviously on a different footing from the pure iambics which are found sporadically in pieces otherwise impure. This material must be reduced in quantity before it can be utilized for our purposes. Firstly by the omission of duplicates and repetitions, including the Parody, which is metrically a mere replica of the original, Catullus 29. 9 = 5, 10 = 2 (except for 'es' instead of 'nisi'), *Catalepton* 6. 6 = Catul-

L

lus 29. 24 ('gener socerque' the *Catalepton*), 12. 1 = 6. 2 (except for 'superbe' instead of 'generque'). Secondly by the omission of corrupt lines or parts of lines which cannot be amended with certainty, Catullus 29. 20, 23, Priap. ii. 9,¹ 15 ('teneraque'), and the last line of *Catalepton* 12, which is merely the cry *Thalasio* thrice repeated. The total number of the lines thus available will be (Catullus 4) 27 + (Catullus 29) 20 + (Priap. Tib.) 45 + (Priap. ii.) 19 + (Catal. 6) 5 + (ib. 12) 7 = 124 + (Horace, *Epode*) 33 = 156.

The consideration of pure iambic lines in detail must necessarily be preceded by a consideration of the metre in general. There are three several varieties of the iambic trimeter as written by Romans in classical times, each marked off from the rest by the degree of strictness with which it adheres to the iambic norm. A. In the trimeter (or senarius) of the drama resolved feet and feet of the apparent value of two units (four 'moras': *Pro-sodia Latina*, §§ 35, 178), as spondees, dactyls, etc., are admissible in all places, odd and even, of the verse except the last. B. In the trimeter of Catullus, Horace, and others, these feet of 2 units are not admitted into the even places, where a foot of $1\frac{1}{2}$ units (3 moras), an iambus or its resolved equivalent, is alone allowed. C is the pure iambic metre. Since the time of Scaliger this has been treated, and the remains in it have been edited, on the supposition that it was a distinct species. The only thing which could distinguish it from B, and which entitles it to the name of 'pure,' is the exclusion of resolved feet and feet of 2 units from all places in the verse. A line which contains such may be a good B (or A), but it is a bad C. Ancient grammarians, as is well known (Terentianus Maurus and Marius Victorinus are examples), took the 'pure iambic' line as the base from which other forms were developed and expanded, and the line selected as an illustration is the first one of Catullus iv., a poem among whose twenty-seven verses there is not one, take any edition you like, that does not satisfy the test

of Terentianus (2185) 'sed ipse uerus integerque sexiens.' The ancients omitted, not inexcusably, to remark that a piece written in pure iambics could not *ex hypothesi* include the impure. What evidence, if any, there is for such a belief must be sought in the seven pieces admittedly² written in that metre.

The following readings of the MSS. of the cited pieces offend against the purity³ of the metre: Catullus 4. 2 'Aiunt . . . celerrimum' ('Ait . . . celerimus' *edd.*), 3 'tardis' ('trabis' *edd.*), 14 'cognitissima' ('cognitissima' *edd.*), 29. 17 'primū' ('prima' *edd.*), 20† 'Nunc gallie timet et britannie,' 23† 'opulentissime,' Priap. Tib. 7 'reuinctus' (reuincte' *edd.*), 29 'Vacuaque' ('Vagaque' *edd.*), Priap. ii. 4 'Tueor' ('Tuor' *most edd.*), 9† 'Mihi glauca oliuo duro cocta frigo' or 'M. gl. oliua duro frigore cocta,' 14 'Teneraque,' 20 'ualentī' ('ualente' *edd.*). Deducting the 3 instances of desperate, or almost desperate, corruption, we have 9 left. In 3 of these the MSS. present something which is ungrammatical or meaningless, the restoration of the pure iambic restores grammar and sense, and all editors accept it; in 4 more the MS. reading is in itself intelligible ('cognitissima'), defensible ('primū'), or unexceptionable ('reuinctus,' 'ualentī') (see above). But everyone of these is displaced by common consent in favour

² Admittedly, I say, disregarding M. Galletier, the last editor of the *Appendix Vergiliana*, 1920, who, apparently after Riese, 1906, and Sabbadini, 1918, believes the view that Priap. ii. is written in pure iambics to be an obsession of the editors: 'note critique' on v. 5 (p. 99, compare p. 100): 'Tous les éditeurs, hantés par l'idée que cette pièce doit être en trimètres purs, écrivent tuor' (for *tueor*). Presumably, then, it is written in B, the metre of Horace, *Epod.* xvii. This piece consists of 81 lines, 7 only of which are pure iambics, unless, with Vollmer, you read 'sonare' in v. 40. But Priap. ii., if we leave out of sight the corrupt v. 9, has, in M. Galletier's own text, 18 pure iambics out of 20 verses. We shall be glad to have from him some explanation of this astonishing difference, and further to know why in line 20 he follows Scaliger in changing the 'ualentī . . . brachio' of the manuscripts, thus giving an ending -ē, which is rare enough in the ablative of the present participle when used as an adjective, unless it be to obtain a 'pure iambic' foot.

³ Other unmetrical readings—e.g. 'amni' for 'amnis' in Catullus 29. 19—are not regarded.

¹ Priap. ii.* in Ellis's *Appendix Vergiliana*.

of pure iambics. With these corrections the account of 'purity' versus 'impurity' in this metre will stand as follows: In Verses—Pure 155, Impure 2. In Feet (5 reckoned to the line, the sixth foot being unchangeable)—Pure 783, Impure 2.

In *Priap.* ii. 4 'Tuor,' which is read by most editors, has more than the support of kindred third conjugation inflexions, 'tuimur,' 'tuitur,' 'tuëre,' etc., in Lucretius and elsewhere; the first person itself appears in a poetical quotation, not improbably from Cicero, in Festus, p. 256(a) 25, and in Statius, *Theb.* 3. 152, in whom it would be an archaism. These forms are not indeed used elsewhere (as *tuor* is here) with the sense of 'protecting.' But we learn from Festus, p. 355, that the old distinction 'tuor uideo, tueor defendo,' had been obliterated in use: 'iam promiscue utuntur.' 'Teneraque,' *ib.* 14, alone is left. This I have briefly discussed in *Mnemosyne* 50 (1922), p. 281. Metre apart, it, like 'tueor,' is unexceptionable. Birt, *ad loc.*, compares Horace, *Carm.* 4. 2. 54 'me tener soluet uitulus relicta | matre.' If we suppose that in 'tueor' a common form has corrupted a rare one, to the injury of the metre, just as in l. 16 of the parody, *Catal.* 10, 'deposuisse' corrupted 'deposisse,' we must suppose likewise that 'tenera' also is a corruption, even though it cannot be amended with certainty. If not, there is nothing left but the supposition that the writer of the piece, knowing the law of the metre, has in a single instance wilfully transgressed it.

The scansion of 'Mămurram,' *Catul.* 29. 3, has been disputed because the 'a' is long in Horace and Martial; for, in spite of Quicherat, s. u., 57. 2 does not prove anything in Catullus, and even if it did, the double quantity would be no more surprising than Ovid's 'Grădius,' *Met.* 6. 427, by 'Grădius' elsewhere. When the writers are different, discrepancy is still less remarkable. Thus 'Porsēna' Horace, Martial, Silius, but 'Porsenna' Vergil, 'Vatīcānus' Horace, but 'Vaticānus' Martial, 'Cātillus' Horace, but others 'Cātillus.' That long syllables which precede the accent in Latin trisyllables may be

shortened is matter of common knowledge—'mam(m)illa,' 'of(f)ella,' 'cur(r)ūlis,' are examples—and if F. Sommer, *Handbuch*, p. 129, is right, a long vowel is shortened in 'mōlēstus' ('mōles') and 'acérbus' ('ācer'), to which 'Mămūrra' would then be exactly parallel.

The composition of the pure iambic having been ascertained, we may examine the accentual conformation of the various words which can and do enter into it. They fall into classes as follows:

MONOSYLLABLES:

1. Short Monosyllables with single consonant when an initial vowel follows:

- (a) σ accented: 'dát.'
- (b) υ unaccented: 'et.'

2. Long Monosyllables:

- (a) σ accented: 'gréx'; 'dát,' etc., before an initial consonant.
- (b) σ unaccented: 'aut'; 'et,' etc., before an initial consonant.

DISYLLABLES:

- (a) σ —'mánū.' [Also $\sigma\upsilon$ at end of a line and in elision.]
- (b) $\sigma\upsilon$ —'ōra.'

HYPERDISYLLABLES of the following forms:

- $\sigma\upsilon$ —'līnteo.' [Also $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon$ at end of a line and in elision.]
- $\upsilon\sigma\upsilon$ —'silente.' [Also $\upsilon\sigma$ — and $\upsilon\sigma\upsilon$ in elision.]
- $\upsilon\sigma\upsilon$ —'superfluens.' [Also $\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\sigma$ in elision.]
- $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\upsilon$ —'imminente.' [Also $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\upsilon$ in elision.]
- $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\upsilon$ —'cognitissima.'
- $\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\sigma$ —'abegimusque.'

We will deal first with the admissible monosyllables, short or long, accented and unaccented. Monosyllables which are long in all circumstances, such as 'grex,' 'aut,' may be at once dismissed from the count. They prove nothing. If they occur in the verse at all, they can only occupy a place on which the metrical ictus falls. There remain the monosyllables, accented as 'dát' and unaccented as 'et,' which give a short or a long syllable according

as the following initial sound is a vowel or a consonant. Their occurrences in our pieces are as follows, A being *coincident* with the metrical ictus and B being *non-coincident*:

ACCENTED MONOSYLLABLES:

A. Catullus xxix. 'quís?' 'sít'; Horace, *Epod.* xvi. 24, 'quís.' Total, 3 exx.

B. Catullus xxix. 'quís?' 'quíd?' 'scít,' 'és,' 6 exx. *Catal.* vi. 5 'út!' 1 ex. *Priap.* ii. 'fít,' 'pól,' 3 exx. *Priap. Tib.* 'quíd,' 'tér,' 4 exx. Total, 14 exx.

['Stát,' *Priap.* ii. 18, is excluded from the count as it could only thus come into the verse. On the accented 'és' and 'sít' compare J. Marouzeau's paper, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*, 15, pp. 230 ff.]

UNACCENTED MONOSYLLABLES:

A. Catullus iv. 'et,' 2 exx.; xxix. 'et,' 'an,' 4 exx. *Catal.* vi. 'nec,' 'et,' 2 exx. *Catal.* xii. 'ut,' 1 ex. *Priap.* ii. 'at,' 1 ex. *Priap. Tib.* 'et,' 'nec,' 'ut,' 4 exx. Hor. *Epod.* xvi. 'et,' 'nec,' 'ut,' 4 exx. Total, 18 exx.

B. Catullus iv. 'et,' 'sed,' 4 exx.; xxix. 'et,' 'ut,' 5 exx. *Catal.* xii. 'et,' 'sed,' 3 exx. *Priap.* ii. 'et,' 1 ex. *Priap. Tib.* 'et,' 'sed,' 'ut,' 4 exx. Hor. *Epod.* xvi. 'at,' 'et,' 'nec,' 4 exx. Total, 21 exx.

In sum, then, there are 14 + 21 (=35) cases of Non-coincidence against 3 + 18 (=21) cases of Coincidence; and the

conclusion is that, if the Romans were not indifferent to coincidence of accent and ictus in monosyllables in this iambic metre written continuously, they avoided rather than pursued it. The 29 single pure iambs in Horace, *Epodes* i.-x. and xvii., tell the same tale. In Accented Monosyllables there are no A's and 5 B's; in Unaccented, 4 A's and 6 B's—total, 4 A's and 11 B's. If these be added to the rest, the full totals will be: A's Accented 3, Unaccented 22—25 in all. B's Accented 19, Unaccented 27—46 in all.

Before dealing with the various groups of hypermonosyllabic words, it will be convenient to state the practice which I shall follow in reckoning the instances of adherent words, whether attached 'enclitically' as *-que*, *-ne*, etc., or 'proclitically' as prepositions immediately preceding their nouns, none of which, it will be observed, have been included among the Monosyllables above. Such combinations are in general reckoned as metrically and accentually equivalent to single words of the same quantity. Thus 'canisque' = 'Priápe,' 'ex ouílibus' = 'lentitúdinis,' 'in aéquore' = 're-cóndita.' One variety alone of these combinations calls for any remark. A preposition preceding a noun of the form *oū*, as 'in pedem,' might conceivably be without accent as in the longer groups, when the accentuation would be 'inpédem,' 'amárei.' But it seems more likely that the general rule of group accentuation was followed, and that 'á marei' was accented like the

A.	No. 1.	No. 2.	No. 3.	No. 4.	No. 5.	No. 6.	Total (1-6).	No. 7.	TOTAL (1-7).
△	19	9	4	2	20	28	82	28	110
△△	23	15	4	3	17	35	97	28	125
△△△	27	15	6	7	16	43	114	27	141
△△△△	5	6	—	1	2	3	17	6	23
△△△△△	5	9	2	3	4	10	33	12	45
△△△△△△	6	1	—	—	1	2	10	2	12
△△△△△△△	—	2	—	—	—	2	4	4	8
	85	57	16	16	60	123	357	107	464
B.	24	14	5	12	18	74	147	23	170
TOTALS ...	109	71	21	28	78	197	504	130	634

old compounds 'dēnuo' = 'dé nouō,' 'flicō' from 'in(s)locō.' These combinations, of which only three occur in the pieces we are considering, to wit 'in iugo,' 'in pedem,' 'ā marei,' in Catullus iv., are, like 'eī mihi,' *Catal.* vi. 4, reckoned among the A's in the annexed table, but their transference to the B's would not appreciably alter the results.

The occurrences of hypermonosyllables in the pieces in question under the two heads A and B are given in the table on p. 164, in which No. 1 means Catullus iv.; 2, Catullus xxix.; 3, *Catalepton* vi.; 4, *Catalepton* xii.; 5, *Priap.* ii.; 6, *Priap. Tib.*; 7, Horace, *Epode* xvi.

In the case, then, of hypermonosyllables, the preponderance of coincidences of accent and ictus over non-coincidences is seen to be established, and requires to be explained. But it does not follow that this coincidence was in itself designed. It is hard to see why coincidence should be avoided in monosyllabic words and pursued in others. Again, what sort of a principle of verse construction would be that which allowed side by side products so radically different as

aquōsus Eūrus ārua rādat īmbribus (Horace),
with five A's, and

licet querāre nec tibi tēner pūer (*Priap. Tib.*),
with not a single A beyond that necessitated by the caesura?

Compare

rōges tūum labōre, quid iūuem mēo
(Horace, *Epod.* i. 15),

with four B's and one A besides that required by the caesura.

To estimate properly the relative preponderance of A's over B's—464 against 170 out of a total of 634—we must consider what sort of a ratio A's would bear to B's in actual speech or writings unaffected by the conditions of metre. The tabulation of feet which has been given above suggests of itself that they would be in a substantial majority. To get some rough notion about this I have counted the A's and the B's in Cicero, *pro Marcello*, chapters 1-5, *de Amicitia*, chapter 1-3, and Salust, *Catiline*, chapters 1-5, and have

found that these in order give 192 + 160 + 148 = 500 A's and 134 + 115 + 86 = 335 B's—together, 835. If these figures approximate to the truth, we might expect the 634 hypermonosyllables in question to give 380 A's and 254 B's instead of 464 and 170 respectively, and infer that the metrical conditions of the Pure Iambic admitted fewer B's and more A's than were current in Prose. Our suspicions are confirmed when we examine the distribution of B's among the feet of our verse. Iambic or pyrrhic words forming complete feet are found distributed as follows:

	No. 1.	No. 2.	No. 3.	No. 4.	No. 5.	No. 6.	No. 7.	TOTAL.
Foot 1	6 ¹	1	1	4	9	17	11	49
" 2	2 ¹	3	—	1	2	4	—	12
" 3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
" 4	—	1	—	1	1	2	—	5
" 5	—	1	1	2	—	11	1	16
" 6	8	5	2	6	2	38	9	70
Totals	16	11	4	14	14	72	21	152

From this we see that such B's are excluded from the third foot, and are far rarer in the second, fourth, and fifth than in the first and sixth. This suggests that, for a real explanation, we must not look to the metrical ictus, whose action is uniform, but to something more variable, as caesura and diaeresis. The effect of diaeresis, or coincident ending of word and foot, if unqualified by caesura (as it is, for example, in the third foot of *Catal.* vi. 4, 'stupore pres|sa rus | abibit et mihi'; *Priap.* ii. 18, 19; Horace, *Epod.* xvi. 20), is to retard the movement of the verse; and this retardation is aggravated if there is pause before as well as after the word. This shows us why 119 out of 152 cases of B are at the beginning or at the end of a line. In the second, fourth, and fifth feet they are rare (33 cases in all), since here they would sensibly diminish the rapidity which is characteristic of this metre. Again, the foot immediately preceding the main caesura has necessarily an A, as 'querāre,' 'labōre,' in the examples cited

¹ iv. 5, 'opus foret' is not counted in, as 'foret' may be enclitic. See above on 'es,' 'sit.'

above. When, therefore, the original numerical superiority of admissible hypermonosyllables with A over the corresponding ones with B is reinforced by avoidance of diaeresis and observance of caesura, the resulting preponderance of A's, great as it is, is seen to be in no wise remarkable. Monosyllables and hypermonosyllables are at one in bearing witness that in this homogeneous metre there is complete justification for the view so clearly stated in the *Métrique grecque et latine* of Havet and Duvau, § 434, 'Les poètes latins de la république sont aussi indifférents que les poètes grecs sur la place des accents. Pour eux aussi la prosodie est tout, l'accent n'est rien.' And for this metre, at any rate, the shade of 'Ictus Metricus' may be left in peace.

I conclude with some observations upon the handling of the metre in the different pieces considered above. Within the strict limits of its 'purity' it has room for variety corresponding to the predilections of the writer or the exigencies of his subject. The seven pieces fall into the following groups: (1) Catullus iv., xxix.; and next to this (2) *Catalepton* vi., xii., by the same hand as the Parody *Catal.* x.; (3) *Priap.* ii.; (4) *Priap. Tib.*; (5) Horace, *Epod.* xvi. In free use of Elision Catullus, as we expect, stands by himself, not hesitating to elide iambic words or words with cretic endings (iv. 17, 15, 24; xxix. 12, and elsewhere). The author of *Priap.* ii.

is nearest; *Catal.* vi., xii., do not follow Catullus here; and *Priap. Tib.* and Horace, *Epode*, elide but seldom. In the endings of their lines Catullus has 13 iambic words (B) in 47 lines, *Catal.* 8 in 12, *Priap.* ii. 2 in 19, Horace 9 in 33, but *Priap. Tib.* 38 in 45.

The use of a non-iambic ending (cretic *et supra*) tends to reduce the number of word accents in a line, thus lightening its gravity and importance. The effect may be illustrated by the much-quoted English verse, 'A Míster Wilkinson, a clérgyman,' which in effect is very near to a pure iambic like 'ut álbulus cólumbus aut Adóneus,' with exactly the same number of word accents. In the same piece we find 'ducéntiens coméssét aut trecéntiens,' 'perambulábit ómnium cubília'; but such slighting conformations are not found in iv. nor in the seriously indignant beginning of xxix., 'quíis hóc póstet uidére, quíis póstet páti.' Horace's *Epode* is, appropriately enough to its subject, a poem of recurring contrasts, marching and skipping alternately; and it seems to be no accident that double diaeresis—i.e. an iambic word in a middle foot—is reserved for the culminating line 66, 'piis secunda uate me | datur | fuga.' The prevalence of diaeresis in *Priap. Tib.* marks it as burlesque, and this is most noticeable in its most mock-serious line, 'licet | querare nec tibi | tener | puer,' quoted above.

J. P. POSTGATE.

QUINTILIAN, THE GOSPELS AND CHRISTIANITY.

THE note by Professor Rose in the February number of the *Review*, under a title differing by one word from the above,¹ gives me an opportunity of rectifying an omission in my edition of Quintilian I.—an omission far more serious than that ascribed to me by Professor Rose, and one which has weighed on my mind since I read Canon Streeter's *The Four Gospels* a few months ago. But before dealing with it I should like to say a little about Professor Rose's point.

Taking the description of precocious children in *I.O.* i. 3, 5,

non multum praestant, sed cito; non subest uera uis nec penitus inmissis radicibus nititur, ut quae summo solo sparsa sunt semina celerius se effundunt et imitatae spicas herbulae inanibus aristas ante messem flaescunt

he finds in it, if I understand him aright, a paraphrase from some comedy, the source of which is betrayed by the fact that in two small bits of it the original metre (in this case cretic) has been preserved. These two bits are the half-line 'non subest uera uis' and the whole line 'ut quae summo solo sparsa

¹ *Quintilian, the Gospels and Comedy*, p. 17.

sunt semina.' He also finds in the whole passage so close an analogy to part of the Parable of the Sower that we must postulate a common source, which may perhaps be the comedy in question.

As to the metrical point, I find it difficult to imagine that anything whatever can be made of the supposed half-line. Surely it must be almost impossible, or at least exceedingly inconvenient, to write a book in Latin prose, without producing two consecutive cretics fairly frequently? As to the full line, it is true that the words 'ut quae summo solo sparsa sunt semina,' composed as they are of a molossus followed by three cretics, exhibit one of the admissible varieties of cretic tetrameters. But is not even this more elaborate combination bound to recur occasionally unless the writer sets himself definitely to avoid it? What indeed about the following in the same chapter (3, 16):

dictu deformia et mox verecundiae?

But I regret to say that I am no adept in these matters; there may be some faw in what I have been arguing, and the above questions are not wholly rhetorical. I stand on ground more familiar to me when I say that I do not think it is at all in Quintilian's manner to drop in and out, so to speak, of a quotation in this way. The vast majority of his quotations are rhetorical or grammatical examples. In his reflective passages his literary reminiscences are either not in quotation form at all, or else are clearly marked as quotations.¹ Such at least is my impression, though here also I am open to conviction.

As to the similarity to the Parable of the Sower, I may say that I deliberately abstained from noting it in my commentary. First, because I thought it unnecessary; probably every reader of the passage is reminded of the Gospel,

without any assistance from me. Secondly, the parallelism, though obvious so far as it goes, is really like the seed 'summo solo sparsa'—somewhat superficial. The common element is the allegorical use of the truth that vegetation without deep root may grow quickly, but does not bear good fruit. This image, which is used again by Quintilian in x. 2. 3, is fairly obvious and not in itself very impressive. The impressiveness of the Sower lies in the combination of this with three other varieties of lot that may befall the seed. The details, moreover, are very different. The rocky subsoil, which is a marked feature in the Gospel version, is absent in Quintilian. The history of the plant, in the one case withered when the sun beats down on it, in the other growing to maturity though grainless, is also different, and the same may be said of the application. There is not much analogy between a precocious boy and the impulsive but weak temperament that cannot resist persecution. Further, the best, though not of course the only justification for illustrative quotation—namely, that one writer is or may be dependent on the other—seemed to be absent in this case. I assumed, as Professor Rose assumes, that neither Quintilian nor the Evangelist could possibly have influenced each other. But I might have felt differently if I had realised the remarkably close contact between Quintilian and Christianity—that the two young princes entrusted to his charge while he was writing the *Institutio* were probably the sons of Christian parents or at least of a Christian mother.

I had indeed known that Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla were often supposed to have been Christians, but I had neither regarded it as an accepted fact nor realised its significance till I read Canon Streeter's pages on the subject.² He rightly enough treats

¹ The nearest approach I have noticed is in ii. 13. 8, where *Aen.* iii. 436 'praecipiam ac repetens iterumque iterumque monebo' is worked into the sentence without any definite mark of quotation. But quoting from Vergil is not the same thing to Quintilian as quoting from a comedy. The same may be said of 'aureo plectro' in x. 1. 63.

² Peterson's remarks (Introduction to Book x., p. x) ought to have led me earlier to the main conclusion of this paper. He notes that it is 'interesting to speculate on the possibility that through intercourse with Clemens and Domitilla and their children Quintilian may have come into contact with' Judaism, which Peterson, I think erroneously, assumes to have been the *θεογονία* of the parents.

the point as one of importance, and pertinently asks us to consider what must have been the psychological effect upon the Roman Church of the 'adhesion to their body of the heir to the throne of Caesar.'¹ For the details of the evidence I must refer, as Canon Streeter does, to Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome*, but the main points may be summarised as follows. The Church tradition that Domitilla was a Christian, who was exiled for the faith, is confirmed by the discovery of a Christian cemetery definitely stated to be her gift. And this is quite in accordance with Dion Cassius' statement that Clemens and his wife were, the one executed, and the other banished, on a charge of 'atheism, on which others also who were diverging into Jewish ways were condemned.'² Lightfoot may perhaps go too far when he says—clearly he means at the time of her exile—that as to the Christianity, at any rate of Domitilla, 'there can be no shadow of doubt.' It is perhaps just possible that the 'atheism' of the two may have been rather of a Jewish type,³ and that her conversion to Christianity followed at a later date, but the other is certainly the more natural solution. This being so, what must we suppose were the relations between this couple and Quintilian? He himself does not mention them, and speaks of the boys as entrusted to him by Domitian himself, and no doubt it is possible that Domitian's suspicions had been aroused and that he sent the boys to Quintilian to counteract the parental influence. But the statement of Ausonius that it

was Clemens who procured for Quintilian the consular insignia does not countenance such a view. Apart from this, all we know about Quintilian goes to show that he would do his best to keep in close relation with the parents of his charges. We remember how he dwells in the first chapter on the importance of both father and mother in early education; and there is a passage in the second chapter in which he seems to me to assert that such a close relation is essential throughout. He is speaking of the truth that the good master will not burden himself with a greater crowd (*turba*) of pupils than he can manage, and proceeds:

in primis ea habenda cura est, ut is omni modo fiat nobis familiariter amicus nec officium in docendo spectet, sed adfectum. Ita nunquam erimus in turba.

On this I wrote: 'Unless Quintilian is suddenly identifying himself with his pupils, he here lays down the important doctrine that personal friendship between teacher and parent is essential to success in education.' And I think we may add without unduly depreciating Quintilian that he would not value this personal friendship less because the parents were of high rank.

What about the other side? Clemens, we have seen, was an admirer if not a friend of Quintilian. As for Domitilla, a princess no doubt may keep her sons' tutor at arm's length. But a Christian at that time must have to a great extent cast aside social prejudices. And further, such an anomaly as a Christian princess can hardly have been brought about without some specially strong convictions. We may be fairly sure that she had with these the missionary temperament, and it is not fanciful to believe that she would yearn to win this 'anima naturaliter Christiana.' Whether he responded at all we cannot guess.⁴

¹ Streeter, p. 536. The spirit of the remark is just, but is the phrasing quite accurate? Did Domitian's adoption of the boys involve any prospect of succession to Clemens himself? We have also to remember that Church tradition does not seem to have put Clemens on a par with Domitilla, and Canon Streeter does not suppose that he was actually baptised. In this case he was neither heir nor adherent in the fullest sense.

² ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκείνῃ δὲ ἀμφόρῳ ἐγκλημα ἀθεότητος, ὅφ' ἦς καὶ ἄλλοι ἐς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξοκέλλοντες κατεδικάσθησαν (D. C. lxvii. 14).

³ Dion's non-mention of Christianity has been explained as the result of bias. Here, at any rate, I should suppose that he is dependent on earlier authorities who did not distinguish between the two.

⁴ The only passages I know which would bear on this are: (a) iii. 7. 21, 'est conditoris urbium infame contraxisse aliquam perniciosam ceteris gentem, qualis est primus Iudaicae superstitionis auctor.' However great was the breach between Jew and Christian, no one with any sympathy for Christianity could have spoken of Moses thus. But I doubt whether the passage is to be taken as any guide to Quintilian's feelings either about

In the face of these probabilities, one can hardly avoid conjecturing whether after all there may not be a link between Quintilian's parable and that of the Gospels. That Mark the 'Roman Gospel' was in the hands of the Roman Church in 95 A.D. would probably be admitted by most, if not all, students of New Testament Origins. Canon Streeter goes further and thinks they had Luke also. His argument, indeed, seems to me a little confused. He suggests, or seems to suggest, that the Third Gospel was an attempt to meet the demand among the Roman aristocracy for a Gospel which satisfied literary taste better than Mark could do, and he goes so far as to suggest that Theophilus may possibly be no other than Clemens himself. But as at the same time he does not think it was written at Rome and dates its composition at least ten and probably fifteen years before the fall of Clemens, this seems rather wild. If, however, all that is meant is that the Third Gospel, whenever it reached Rome, found a ready acceptance in Clemens' circle, I have no doubt the statement is true. Luke's style and feeling, and in particular his superior *τάξις* in the rhetorical sense, would attract those whom Mark would repel. Still I think the case for a connexion between the two parables would really be stronger if Mark only was known at Rome at the time.¹ When Luke came to the front, the parable of the Sower would not indeed be dwarfed—it remains the premier parable in all three gospels—but it would be rivalled or outrivalled by

others, notably the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan. The reader of Mark on the other hand, though informed that Christ's teaching consisted of parables—'without a parable spake he not unto them'—found very little of this nature except the group in which the Sower comes. The other parable of any length is the Wicked Husbandmen, which would principally be useful as a weapon against the Jews. The group contains two other parables besides the Sower, also drawn from vegetation, and the slighter of these, one so slight that neither Matthew or Luke reproduced it—I mean, 'The Seed growing secretly'—has some affinities with Quintilian. It describes how the true corn passes from blade to ear and from ear to full grain in the ear. It thus makes a good contrast with Quintilian's corn, which has blade, ear, but no grain in the ear. We may be sure that this group would be much in the mind of Roman readers of Mark, and it is certainly not impossible that Clemens or Domitilla may have passed these thoughts on to Quintilian.

I have no wish to exaggerate these possibilities, for I still hold that the resemblances are such as might easily have been produced by independent thinkers. But if they seemed to me so strong as they do to Professor Rose, I should have no hesitation in saying that the natural explanation was, not that the two were influenced by some common ancestor, but that Quintilian had either through Domitilla or by direct reading borrowed from the Evangelist, and that we had here the first adaptation of the Gospels in a pagan writer and perhaps the first in any writer.²

This would indeed be a startling result. But even if we dismiss these speculations as fanciful, the fact that remains is startling enough. Quintilian was almost certainly in contact, and according to all psychological probability

Moses or the Jews. He is merely sketching lines of argument which speakers might or did adopt. His dislike to Jews was at any rate not strong enough to prevent him from pleading for Queen Berenice in a Jewish court (iv. 1. 19).
(b) The general tone of the well-known lament over the death of his younger son in the Proem of Book vi.: there is certainly not the slightest tinge of the Christian hope in this.

¹ The non-Marcan document (which we call Q) which Matthew and Luke reproduced was probably, I imagine, not current at Rome. Otherwise we might have expected it to be preserved as Mark was, when it, like Q, was superseded. But, even if Q was known at Rome, it seems doubtful whether it contained much parabolic teaching (*v. Streeter*, pp. 243 and 291).

² Of the earliest Christian writers, *Clement* is usually dated a year or two after the *Institutio*. As to *Barnabas* estimates vary greatly, but some critics certainly put it as late as 97 or later. As for the *Didache*, a considerable body of opinion would, I believe, place it in the first century, but not necessarily earlier than 95.

in intimate and friendly contact, with one or perhaps two eminent Christians. Nothing like this can be said of any

extant pagan writer in the first or indeed in the second century.

F. H. COLSON.

SOME 'PROGRAMME' COIN-TYPES OF ANTONINUS PIUS.

THE frequent use of the reverse-types of Roman coins as a means of recording historical events is a fact with which everyone is familiar. The Roman world found on its current coinage that which the modern world finds in its public press, the announcement of important affairs that had recently taken place, of victories, treaties, social and economic changes and the like. But the press, besides telling us what has happened, also informs us of what is about to happen; it aims, moreover, at forming public opinion, at putting matters before us in some particular light. This second function of the modern press was also performed by Roman coins, especially under the Empire. At all periods of the history of the Imperial coinage we find the Emperors using reverse-types for propaganda, for the purpose of ventilating their aims and of disseminating ideas with some future end in view. Before the publication of the first volume of the British Museum Catalogue of the Coins of the Roman Empire this interesting aspect of Roman coins had not, perhaps, received from English writers all the attention it deserves, whereas it has been a subject of study, especially of recent years, among German numismatists.¹ The object of this paper is to consider a small series of 'programme' types which, curiously enough, seem never to have been regarded in this light by the historians and numismatists who have described them, and which do not find a place in recent German literature on 'Programm-' and 'Propaganda-Münzen.'

¹ Kenner, *Programm-Münzen römischer Kaiser* (Num. Zeitschrift, XVII., 1885, p. 51 ff.); Stückelberg, *Die römischen Kaisermünzen als Geschichtsquellen*, 1915, p. 10; O. T. Schulz, *Vom Prinzipat zum Dominat*, 1919, pp. 69, 135-8; Volkmann, *Zeitschrift für Num.*, 1923, pp. 61, 62; Regling, *Zeitschrift für Num.*, 1924, p. 119; O. T. Schulz, *Die Rechtstitel und Regierungsprogramme auf römischen Kaisermünzen (Von Cäsar bis Severus)*, 1925.

As is, of course, well known, the Emperor Antoninus Pius did not share the philhellenic and cosmopolitan tastes of his predecessor Hadrian. He made no grand tours through the Empire,² and probably went abroad only once, if at all, during his reign. His interests lay in Rome and Italy and in the attempt to revive the national religion of Rome and to arouse an enthusiasm for ancient Roman and Italian legend and history.³ Hence the zeal with which, in 147 A.D., he celebrated the nine-hundredth anniversary of the foundation of Rome.⁴ The connexion between this celebration and six fine bronze medallions of Pius with scenes from early Roman history as their reverse types has often been pointed out.⁵ One bears the legend COCLES, and shows Horatius swimming the Tiber, with the Pons Sublicius in the background. On the left bank stand three Roman soldiers, one of whom is seen in the act of destroying the bridge with an axe; on the right bank are two Etruscans, one of them aiming at Horatius with a spear.⁶ On another, bearing the legend NAVIVS, the augur Attus Navius is cutting the whetstone in the presence of Tarquinius Priscus.⁷ On the third is a scene which seems to

² Iuli Capitolini *Antoninus Pius*, 7, 11, 'nec ullas expeditiones obiit, nisi quod ad agros suos profectus est ad Campaniam.'

³ *Ibid.* 13, 4, 'qui rite comparetur Numae cuius . . . caerimonias semper obtinuit'; *ibid.* 11, 5, 'nec ullum sacrificium per vicarium fecit, nisi cum aeger fuit.' C.I.L. (referring to a monument erected by the senate to the Emperor) 'ob insignem erga caerimonias publicas curam et religionem.'

⁴ Sexti Aurelii Victoris *Liber de Caesaribus*, 15, 4, 'celebrato magnifice urbis nongentesimo.'

⁵ Bury, *The Student's Roman Empire*, p. 528; Stuart Jones, *The Roman Empire*, p. 201; Sydenham, *Historical References on Coins of the Roman Empire from Augustus to Gallienus*, p. 105; Froehner, *Médailles romaines*, p. 58.

⁶ Gnechchi, *I medaglioni romani*, II., tav. 43, 4.

⁷ *Ibid.* tav. 46, 3, 4.

come straight from the *Aeneid*.¹ In the centre stands a colossal Hercules, looking towards the left, with his lion skin over his left shoulder and his club in his right hand. On the right, in front of a rocky cave with a tree growing on it, lies the carcass of the monster Cacus, and on the left, represented on a much smaller scale than the hero himself, are four inhabitants of the Aventine region, one of whom appears to be kissing the hand of his deliverer, while his companions stand marvelling at the deed just accomplished:

* Nequeunt expleri corda tuendo
terribiles oculos, vultum villosaque setis
pectora semiferi atque exstinctos faucibus ignes.²
Aen. VIII. 265-7.

The fourth shows Aeneas, who leads Ascanius by the hand, disembarking from his ship upon the coast of Latium.² In front of him, in a cave with a tree growing beside it, is the famous white sow with her litter, and in the background are seen the walls and towers of Lavinium. On the fifth are represented, in the foreground the walls of Lavinium with a gate and two towers, the sow with her young in the middle distance, and in the background, between a circular shrine and an altar on one side and a well (?) with a tree behind it on the other, Aeneas walking towards the left with Anchises upon his shoulders.³ The senate followed the Emperor's example and issued a sixth medallion with the letters S.C. on the reverse, which shows Aeneas walking to the right and holding Ascanius by the hand, while he carries on his shoulders Anchises with the Penates.⁴

All the writers whom I have mentioned as describing these medallions appear to assume that they were struck on the occasion of, or in commemoration of, the celebration of the birthday of Rome. Bury writes of 'the coins issued on the occasion of the Secular Games.' Stuart Jones records that Antoninus Pius 'in A.D. 147 celebrated the nine-hundredth

anniversary of the birthday of Rome, issuing in commemoration of the event a fine series of medallions representing the early legends of the city and its founder.' 'In the year 147,' writes Sydenham, 'Antoninus celebrated the nine-hundredth anniversary of the foundation of Rome. Although a number of medallions were struck on this occasion, it is perhaps surprising that no coins, issued in this year, make any direct reference to it. The familiar type of the Wolf and Twins, which is found on the coins of Antoninus, though appropriate to this anniversary, occurs some years earlier, during his third consulship.' Finally Froehner says: 'L'an 900 (147 de notre ère) il célébra les jeux séculaires en souvenir de la fondation de Rome, et cette date, l'inauguration d'un nouveau siècle, a dû inspirer les graveurs de nos médaillons.'

Now had these medallions really been struck on the occasion of or to commemorate the Secular Games in 147 their legends would have described the Emperor as COS IIII., for Pius assumed his fourth consulship in 145 and retained it until his death in 161. But with the exception of the fifth medallion, which does not make any mention in its legend of the Emperor's consulship, though it obviously belongs to our series, all bear the legend COS III., and they must therefore have been struck during Pius's third consulship, during the years 140-144, at least three years before the actual celebration. They are, in fact, one of the most striking instances of 'programme' types presented to us by Roman Imperial coins. They were not struck as a record of the Secular Games, but to herald them and to prepare for them. It is not surprising that there are no coin-types of 147 which refer directly to the celebration, or that the 'Wolf and Twins' coins had been struck several years earlier.⁵ The coins bearing this symbol, familiar even to the

¹ *Ibid.* tav. 53, 1.

² *Ibid.* tav. 54, 9.

³ *Ibid.* tav. 58, 8.

⁴ *Op. cit.* III. tav. 160, 1, cf. *aureus* and *sestertius* of Pius with the same type and the legend TR. POT. COS. III. on the reverse (Cohen, *Les monnaies de l'empire romain*, 2, II., p. 358, no. 908, p. 335, no. 655).

⁵ Cohen, *op. cit.* II., p. 313, nos. 447, 448. There is a bronze medallion of the same date, with the legend COS III., showing Jupiter standing by an altar on which the Wolf and Twins are represented in relief (Gnecchi, *op. cit.* II., 43, 6). Bronze coins with the 'Sow and Young' reverse-type were also issued at the same date (Cohen, *op. cit.* 2, II., p. 313, no. 450).

most ignorant and unlettered citizen of Rome, were 'programme' types, like the medallions, which, with their greater wealth of allusion and smaller circulation, were, perhaps, chiefly intended for the more educated circles of Roman society. There was no need to repeat such types on coins or medallions of 147. It was not, indeed, the occasion which, according to Froehner, inspired the medal engravers, but the medal engravers who inspired the occasion. Just as for months before the opening of the Wembley Exhibition we received our correspondence embellished with the legend 'British Empire Exhibition,' while the word 'Wembley' stared at us daily from the Press; so, several years before the occasion itself, perhaps at the moment when the preparations were systematically begun, Antoninus Pius issued these medallion- and coin-types that he might stir the pride of his subjects in their glorious past and prepare them to celebrate with enthusiasm the nine-hundredth anniversary of the birthday of Rome.

With these six medallions bearing the head of Pius on the obverse we should, I think, group three medallions of Faustina the Elder with similar scenes from Roman legend and history. On all three of these medallions the Empress is described on the obverse as DIVA. They were therefore struck after her death, and as that event occurred in 141 there is nothing against the supposition that they, like the companion types of Pius, were struck during his third consulship, in 140-144. One of them represents the appearance of Mars to Rhea Silvia, a type which occurs on coins of Pius struck during these years.¹ The second has on the reverse the legend AETERNIT and a spirited scene² which shows the Sabine women with their children intervening in the conflict between their Roman husbands and indignant parents, an excellent illustration of the passage in Livy (I. 13): 'Tum Sabinæ mulieres . . . crinibus passis scissaque veste victo malis muliebri pavore ausae se

inter tela volantia inferre, ex transverso impetu facto dirimere infestas acies, dirimere iras.' On the third we have the story of Claudia Quinta (Ovid, *Fasti*, iv., 305-328).³ On the left of the design is a galley on which is seated Cybele on a throne, flanked by lions, and on the right is Claudia Quinta dragging the vessel to land, accompanied by three women with torches.

In addition to the series of historical scenes there are two 'programme' medallion- and coin-types of Pius with allegorical figures, which belong to what might be called his Romano-Italian reaction against the cosmopolitan policy of his predecessor. In preparation for the Secular Games and partly, perhaps, as a counterblast to Hadrian's numerous *Nilus* types, there were issued during Pius's third consulship a large senatorial bronze medallion⁴ and sestertii⁵ with the legend TIBERIS and a figure representing the river as an old man, half-draped, who reclines to the left and leans on an urn from which water flows, holding a reed in his left hand while his right rests upon the prow of a ship—the 'deus Tiberinus senior' of the *Aeneid* (VIII. 31). The second type, which represents *Italia* personified, occurs on a bronze medallion⁶ and on gold, silver and bronze coins.⁷ *Italia* wears a mural crown, a chiton and a himation, holds a sceptre in her left hand and a cornucopiae in her right, and is seated to the left on a large globe decorated with stars. The *Italia* medallion was issued in 140-144 (COS III.), the coins three times, in 139 (COS II.), in 140-144 (COS III.), and in 145 or after (COS III.). This type was doubtless intended to serve, with our other types, as propaganda for the celebration of 147. But it also refers to a larger programme, of which the Secular Games were themselves only a part. Hadrian had refused to treat Italy as a privileged province, or to single her out in any way from among the other countries of the

³ Gneccchi, *op. cit.* II., p. 25, no. 9; Cohen, *op. cit.* 2, II., p. 439, no. 307.

⁴ Gneccchi, *op. cit.* III., tav. 160, 2.

⁵ Cohen, *op. cit.* 2, II., p. 351, nos. 817-824.

⁶ Gneccchi, *op. cit.* II., tav. 45, 10.

⁷ Cohen, *op. cit.* 2, II., p. 314-5, nos. 463-472.

¹ Gneccchi, *op. cit.* II. tav. 57, 3; Cohen, *op. cit.* 2, II., p. 356, nos. 885-7.

² Gneccchi, *op. cit.* II. tav. 56, 6.

Empire. His *Italia* coin-type¹ bears no emblem of predominance to distinguish her from other wealthy and civilised provinces such as Asia or Bithynia. But the great star-bespangled globe, on which Pius's *Italia* is seated, is a definite

mark of sovereignty, and thus the type foreshadowed and symbolised his whole attitude and policy with regard to the relation of the rest of the Empire to Italy, who ought, in his eyes, to rank high above all others as the sovereign province.

¹ Cohen, *op. cit.* 2, II., p. 178, nos. 867-870.

JOCELYN TOYNBEE.

THE MOTHER GODDESS.

FROM the evidence at our disposal it has been commonly concluded that the great goddess of the Minoan world was predominantly connected with the earth, with its fruits and with animal life.¹ Sir Arthur Evans has recently suggested that she is celestial, basing this view on a ring from Thisbe with a representation upon it which he regards as a genuine Mycenaean work.² A goddess, accompanied by attendants, is shown seated and holding poppy-capsules; above her, in the upper margin of the field, are wavy lines. The whole resembles the famous signet found on the Acropolis at Mycenae: there a rayed disk and a crescent (probably the sun and the moon) are to be seen above the wavy lines. The latter certainly indicate the sky, possibly, as Mr. A. B. Cook suggests, the Milky Way.³ Nevertheless, it can hardly be correct to regard these lines 'as signifying the celestial character of the deity below.' They stand for the sky, set above the earth: on the signet found at Mycenae the shield or idol of a god and a double axe descend from the sky. The goddess is on the earth and of the earth. The poppy-capsules which she holds are no doubt, as Sir Arthur says, 'an emblem of fertilisation'; as such they suit an earth-goddess. Later we find them associated with Demeter at Eleusis, a cult-place from Mycenaean times, and with Rhea, or again as typical specimens of

the fruits of the earth.⁴ Another ring from the same hoard (No. 9), also adduced in support of the view that she is celestial, shows the goddess holding two swans, with a small orb on one side of her head and a star on the other.⁵ This is an artist's treatment of the familiar conception of the *πότνια θηρών*: he has put in a star and an orb out of his imagination, possibly stimu-

⁴ Cf. H. G. Pringsheim, *Archäologische Beiträge zur Geschichte des eleusinischen Kults* 252, and for the poppy's connexion with Demeter elsewhere Farnell, *Cults* III. 218; with Rhea, Gruppe, *Griech. Myth.* 1542; with Aphrodite at Sicyon, *ib.* 130; with Artemis, *ib.* 1274; it occurs in a cornucopia on a coin of Tralles, A. B. Cook, *Zeus* I. 503; it is associated with ears of corn on coins of Cilbani (*B.M.C. Lydia* 64. 1, Pl. VII. 6), of Smyrna (*B.M.C. Ionia* 253. 148, Pl. XXVI. 16), and of Synnada (*B.M.C. Phrygia* 393, n. 5 f., Pl. XLVI. 2). Poppies are perhaps the flowers held by the priestess or goddess on one of the Palaikastro moulds (Karo, *l.c.* 146, fig. 26).

⁵ *J.H.S.* XLV. 23 ff., fig. 26, Pl. II. 5. Even Persephone is represented with a star on either side of her head on bronze coins of Locri of the third century B.C. (Carelli-Cavedoni, *Numi veteris Italiae* CXC. 36 f., J. Babelon, *Collection de Luynes* I. 149, n. 774, Pl. XXVI.: she has in her left hand a sceptre ending in a poppy-head, in her right a patera: the latter object is clear on the Weber, Leake, and British Museum specimens, although that on the De Luynes specimen is described as 'une couronne'). Here the stars are probably intended to suggest the Dioscuri, credited with having won the battle of Sagra (B. Pick, *Jahrb. arch. Inst.* XXXII., 1917, 209 f.): Persephone is purely chthonic (cf. G. Giannelli, *Culti e miti della magna Grecia*, 226 ff.; Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* I. i. 161 does not advance definite arguments in favour of his view that she is originally lunar). On contemporary bronze coins of Locri Athena is represented with two stars (Carelli-Cavedoni CXC. 30, De Luynes I. 149, n. 772 f.) or one star (Carelli-Cavedoni CXC. 31 f.) in the field. For the insertion of stars to fill space we may perhaps compare a geometric sherd from the Argive Heraion, figured by B. Schweitzer, *Herakles*, 17.

¹ We must not endeavour to simplify her functions overmuch: cf. M. P. Nilsson, *History of Greek Religion*, 18 f.

² *J.H.S.* XLV. 12 ff., fig. 11, pl. II. 1.

³ *Zeus* II. 516 (as Karo, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* VII. 149): a photograph of the ring from Mycenae is given by Evans, *J.H.S.* XLV. 11, fig. 12.

lated by *horror vacui*. We may offer the same explanation of a lentoid from the Idaean cave, showing a female figure blowing a conch before a horned altar (or base with sacral horns above it) set beneath three trees; on the left of the altar is an object identified as an idol by Miss K. McElderkin, on the right a rayed symbol. Is it not a forced interpretation to regard this, as Miss McElderkin does, as signifying 'the sanctuary of Aphrodite in her character as a fertility-goddess and a deity of the heavens and of the oceans'?¹ Any inferences from such products of pure imagination as to religious ideas are, if unsupported, hazardous. It is otherwise with the first mentioned ring from Thisbe: that seems to exhibit a scene of cult transferred to the divine plane, itself also shaped by the artist's mind; while not a photographic record of ritual, it shows, probably, ritual idealised.² This

distinction is of some general importance.

The nameless goddess, then, is mistress of the earth, of its fruits, of their rebirth in spring, mistress also no doubt of the underworld;³ in short, she is primarily chthonic, and if she attained celestial significance it was at most secondary, like that of Ge Olympia.⁴ For such significance clear Minoan or Mycenaean evidence may come to light; she may indeed, like other chthonic goddesses, as probably Europa and Dictynna, and perhaps Hera, have become lunar.⁵ This possibility may seem to be rendered more likely by the association of a woman with a disk, probably solar, on a stone mould found near Palaikastro: if the woman is a goddess, she may well be thought of as lunar. At the same time, she may equally well be a priestess, displaying the emblem of a god, and this evidence is therefore quite uncertain.⁶

A. D. NOCK.

¹ *Am. Journ. Arch.* XXIX. (1925) 53 ff.: the lentoid is figured also by Evans, *J.H.S.* XXI. 142, fig. 25, and Bossert, *Alt-kreta*² 232, n. 323a. To use the name Aphrodite is hazardous: we may say that the Aphrodite of historic times inherits many of the functions of the Aegean mother goddess, or again that the Aphrodite of Eryx and the similar goddess of Segesta are in essence Hellenised forms of a pre-Greek mother goddess (cf. Ciaceri, *Culti e miti nella storia dell' antica Sicilia*, 86 f., Ziegler, *P.W.* II.A 1068. She is in fact akin to the Aegean goddess, cf. Evans, *B.S.A.* IX. 87, 89; *Archaeol.* LXV. 10). So did other goddesses also. I do not wish to deny that the great Minoan goddess was concerned with the sea. As the deity of a seafaring people she could not fail to be. Further, we have the evidence of the shells found in a 'chapel' in the Palace, cf. Evans, *Palace of Minos* I. 517 ff.; E. J. Forsdyke, *Primitive Aegean Pottery in the B.M.* 158, 194. So later Aphrodite was worshipped as Εὐπλοία at the Piraeus, and at Cnidos, Mylasa, Aegae, and Olbia (cf. G. M. Hirst, *J.H.S.* XXIII. 24 f.).

² Cf. the new fragment (*P. Oxy.* 1604, reprinted in Sandys' *Pindar*² 558) of a dithyramb by Pindar, l. 5 [σοφοὶ δὲ ἐμδότες | οἶαν Βρομίου τελετὰν | καὶ παρὰ σκάπτων Διὸς οὐρανίδαι | ἐν μεγάροις ἰστάντι for the idea of the heavenly performance of ritual, also the participation of a divine figure in the ritual depicted in the Villa Irim and the presence thereof of Dionysus and Ariadne (*Notizie degli scavi*, 1910, Pl. XV. f.=*J.R.S.* III., Pl. XII., XI.: we may cling to this interpretation of the paintings in view of these parallels in spite of the criticisms

of F. Cumont, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* LXXXV., 1922, 83 ff.), the presence of deities at the Aldobrandini Marriage (Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen* III. 317, Abb. 709; they perform certain duties), and the frequent representations on coins of a god performing the sacrifice due to himself, in illustration of this idealisation of cult in art. For art it is moreover sufficient to indicate a ceremony, as the Scirophoria is probably indicated on vases discussed by E. Buschor, *Jahrb. arch. Inst.* XXXVIII./XXXIX. 128 ff. In general cf. M. P. Nilsson, *op. cit.* 11 ff.

³ Evans, *loc. cit.* 61, and earlier in *Archaeologia* LXV. (1914) 54 ff.

⁴ Pausan. I. 18. 7, to which Mr. A. B. Cook kindly drew my attention.

⁵ Cf. A. B. Cook, *Zeus* I. 524-543 (suggested explanations being Phoenician religion and assimilation to the lunar aspect of Artemis), 455 ff. (Hera), 730 ff. Mr. R. B. Onians has drawn my attention to the natural connexion of the moon with processes of growth. Porphyry *ap. Euseb. Praep. evang.* III. 11, 31 ff. makes Athena, Artemis, the Moirai, Demeter, Kore, all lunar; but this is merely late theorising.

⁶ I follow A. B. Cook, *Zeus* II. 625 (where an illustration of the mould will be found). It should further be observed that the mould is a late product of the great prehistoric Cretan civilisation, and has affinities with objects found in Central Europe, cf. E. J. Forsdyke, *op. cit.* 204, 206.

VARIA.

(i.) MR. R. L. DUNBABIN (C.R. XXXIX., p. 112) sides with the scholiast and Friedländer against Duff (and Mayor) in making *cophinus faenum-que* in Juvenal (III. 14, cf. VI. 542) refer to hay-box cookery. I have long taken it that way, and would add to his description of how it is done the following evidence of the survival among Jews of practically the same method of avoiding a breach of the Sabbath by the work involved in cooking a dinner. A former student of mine, a member of a Jewish family now living in this country, writes, 'In my mother's and father's homes in Russia, the ingredients for Saturday's dinner were put into a stove which was then hermetically sealed, on Friday, and left to cook until dinner-time on Saturday. . . . Of course, the meal must be put in to cook before the Sabbath begins,' i.e., before sundown on Friday. Juvenal's intense hatred of Jews seems to have made him fairly observant of their ways, cf. his correct use of *caeli numen* (= *šāmāyim*) in XIV. 97, where see Mayor's note.

(ii.) Mr. Charlesworth (*ibid.*, p. 115, note 5) supports the suggestion of Mr. Mattingly (J.R.S. X., p. 38) that the dying words of Seneca and of Thræsea, in Tacitus (*Annals* XV. 64, XVI. 35), about a libation to Iuppiter Liberator, contain a sarcastic allusion to Nero's title of Zeus Eleutherios. This involves the further supposition that both incidents are unhistorical, since the title is associated with Nero's journey to Greece, and appears in its Latin form on a rare coin, minted in Greece in 66-67, when both Seneca and Thræsea were dead, see Mattingly, *loc. cit.* That is of course a perfectly possible supposition, for everyone knows that prominent men have 'last words' invented for them at all dates after their deaths. Yet, when one recollects what incurable poseurs both these members of His Majesty's most disloyal Opposition were, it seems quite as likely that the stories are true. Seneca was posing as a dying Sokrates (cf. Plato, *Phaedo*

117 B, 118 A), and Thræsea was imitating him, as some sixteen hundred and fifty years later Addison on his death-bed echoed Thræsea's *specta, iuuenis*, by inviting Warwick to see 'in what peace a Christian could die.' Iuppiter Liberator would be an appropriate deity, as freeing them at once from the body and from Nero, besides the allusion, long ago suggested by Lipsius, to the final libation to Zeus Soter. At the same time, Mr. Mattingly's view might seem to receive some support from the dying words of Theramenes, *Κρίτα τοῦτ' ἔστω τῷ καλῷ* (Xen. *Hell.* II. 3, 56).

(iii.) In reply to Mr. Broadhead's defence of Doederlein's conjecture *nisi nostro sanguine* (Cic. *de orat.* I. 225), may I say—

(a) I certainly attach importance to the scansion of the passage, for on that, and on that alone, I base my colometry. In this matter the authority of Aristotle (*Rhet.* III. 1409a 19) and, what usually goes with it, common sense are my guides. The comma after *eorum* in many modern texts is perfectly correct, by the rules of German grammar, which has nothing to do with classical rhetoric. I follow Zielinski's system because, after careful study of both it and its rivals (including Mr. Broadhead's own), I am daily more certain of its correctness.

(b) But let my colometry be as wrong as Mr. Broadhead likes, that does not alter the fact that *nostro*, being a 'definitive' adjective, to borrow M. Marouzeau's terminology, must be emphatic, because it stands before its substantive instead of after it. Doederlein's conjecture would throw the emphasis on *sanguine*, and therefore involve the further change *nisi sanguine nostro*. I am willing, therefore, to withdraw the epithet 'silly,' and substitute 'impossible' with regard to that ill-judged attempt.

(c) As to Antonius' criticism, that concerns itself with *servire*, and not with *nostro* at all, so any discussion of it seems to be rather off the point.

H. J. ROSE.

ΛΟΓΙΟΣ AND ΛΟΓΙΟΤΗΣ.

By modern writers on the Greek drama *λογιότης*, as applied in Plutarch (*de Glor. Athen.* c. 5) to the poetry of Sophocles, is understood in different ways. But Plutarch seems clearly to mean 'eloquence' (Cicero is called *λόγιος* in the well-known story at the end of the *Vit. Cic.*), and to indicate something other than Euripides' *σοφία* (a subtlety akin to sophistical rhetoric) and than the *στόμα* (a full-mouthed utterance bordering sometimes on bombast) of Aeschylus. So Strabo (*Geogr.* XIII. 2) says that Aristotle, while making all his pupils *λογίους*, made Theophrastus *λογιώτατον*, where the context shows that the meaning is not 'learned,' as writers on Greek philosophy often give it, but 'good at speech.' Phrynichus states expressly that, in his time (that of the Antonines), *λόγιος* was the regular term for a good speaker of the elevated type, whereas *οἱ ἀρχαῖοι* had denoted by it expert narrators of national history.

The *λογιότης* attributed by Plutarch to Sophocles corresponds, in fact, to 'εἵκεν εὐεπίης' ["bene dicendi," "eloquentiae"] *πινυτόφρονος* in the epigram of Simmias. The eloquent speeches in Sophocles' extant plays attest the truth of Plutarch's and Simmias' judgment. Such *εὐτεπεία* as this is not of an age, but for all time: τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶν ἔρπει, | εἴ τις εὐεπίη τι.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

CALLIMACHUS, *EPIG.* XXI.

It has already been observed that there are two good reasons for regarding this epigram as

incomplete: the name of the deceased is not mentioned, and the praise of his father and his son makes the absence of a compliment to himself so conspicuous as to be almost insulting. What does not seem to have been noticed is that the last couplet,

οὐ νέμεσις· Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὄσους ἔδον δμῳαὶ παῖδας
μὴ λοξῶ, πολιοῦς οὐκ ἀπέθνετο φίλους,

as commonly interpreted, is futile and irrelevant. What, after all, is it which is not to excite *νέμεσις*: Callimachus' poetic achievement? or Battus' luck in having a general for his father and a poet for his son? And the ground, forsooth, on which we are invited to refrain from *νέμεσις* is that the poetic gift, once bestowed in childhood, endures even in senility. Surely this is intolerably chaotic thinking.

Now the structure and cadence of this couplet are admirably suited for the conclusion of an epigram. Assume the lacuna, therefore, *after line 4*; suppose it to have contained not only Battus' name and some compliment to him, with perhaps mention (as Wilamowitz suggests) of the original Battus, but also the information that he died young. Then the last couplet will follow naturally enough, provided we regard the antecedent to *ὄσους* as *subject of ἀπέθνετο*, and give that verb the sense of *ἀπέθηκε* in *Epig.* XIX. 'We must not complain of Battus' early death: for those children on whom the Muses have looked with favour do not bury their kinsfolk (*i.e.* fathers) grey-headed.' A rash generalisation, maybe, but at any rate relevant.

GILBERT A. DAVIES.

REVIEWS

ARISTOTLE'S *METAPHYSICS*.

Aristotle's Metaphysics. A revised text with introduction and commentary by W. D. Ross. Two vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Cloth, 48s. net.

I GLADLY accede to the flattering invitation of the editors to review Mr. Ross's edition of the *Metaphysics*, though in England itself there is no lack of Aristotelians who might have been invited to introduce to the readers of the *Classical Review* a work so honourable to English scholarship. It may be, however, of some interest to hear the point of view of Aristotelian study in present-day Germany. My title to speak is earned, I suppose, not only by my repeated attempts at the emendation of the text and by my works on the genesis of the *Metaphysics* and on Aris-

totle's philosophical development, but more by the fact that for some years past I have had in readiness a critical edition of the text of the treatise. The need for such an edition is of course not removed by Ross's work; but perhaps he is himself undertaking a smaller edition for the Oxford Classical Series. The text of his large edition certainly provides a satisfactory foundation. For he has not contented himself with commenting on an existing text: he has begun by constructing his own text. This is even more necessary with the *Metaphysics* than with other Aristotelian works. It is true that a master like Bonitz in his classical edition and commentary (1848/9) had made a number of happy emendations in Bekker's standard Berlin text, and had also re-

covered numerous correct readings from the commentary of Alexander Aphrodisiensis. But since Bekker's edition (1831) the manuscripts had not been again collated, with the exception of Parisinus E, which W. Christ collated for his unimportant Teubner text (1885). (The Florentine A^b he merely sampled.) Since then the Berlin Academy has given us a critical edition of Alexander and the other ancient commentators on the *Metaphysics*, Asclepius and Syrianus. Finally, in 1892 the late Professor Gercke of Breslau drew attention to a Vienna manuscript of Aristotle, which, like the Vienna Plato manuscript used by Professor Burnet, had surprisingly long escaped exploitation by scholars. This was Vindob. phil. gr. 100 (saec. X ineuntis); not only the oldest surviving manuscript of the *Metaphysics*, but also among the first in value. With all this new material, a new recension of the text was a real need.

Mr. Ross has performed this task with untiring energy, with meticulous accuracy of detail, and with an acuteness worthy of its object. Since Bonitz brought in Alexander, the question how to treat the manuscripts has admittedly entered on a new phase. With Alexander's aid we can decide more certainly between the readings of the two chief recensions, E and A^b, his text being intermediate between them. The precise determination of his reading is therefore always important. This tiresome task Mr. Ross has performed, giving in his apparatus not merely Alexander's precise citations, but also a determination of the text where we are obliged to infer it indirectly from the exegesis. Asclepius and (still more) Syrianus are far behind Alexander in value: in textual questions they lack the critical independence which marks Alexander and above all Simplicius. But further aid to a decision between the two traditions is provided in numerous cases by the new Vienna codex (J). Mr. Ross has rightly avoided the mistake of thinking that the agreement of J with E or A^b decides with mechanical certainty in favour of a reading. E alone is often preferred to A^b, and A^b to EJ (much the commoner conjunction). In forty-four cases J is the sole witness to

the truth. In his Preface, in which he discusses with great care the relations of the manuscripts, Mr. Ross has not attempted any historical treatment of these easily determined facts. In my papers on the emendation of the text (*Hermes*, 52, 1917, and the Berlin Academy's *Sitzungsberichte*, 1924) I explained J and E as two representatives, not far separated in time, of a common original with variants in its margin. It must clearly have been a Byzantine diorthosis similar to the Roman manuscript O which contains Plato's *Laws*. It gave a text purified as far as possible, but based, as the marginal variants show, not on a single recension alone. The fairly frequent agreements between J and A^b (in general, as I have said, J follows E) are explained by the fact that in this diorthosis use was made also of readings belonging to the recension represented to us by A^b. The writer of J made independent choice among the variants found in the original, choosing often differently from E, but then often at least noting E's reading in the margin.

The controversy whether one can follow E in principle, or whether a critical and cautious but still considerable reliance on A^b is not inevitable, is thus settled. E and J together represent a Byzantine edition, based on sources of various derivation between which decision is impossible without careful examination. On the other hand A^b, though extremely faulty, much interpolated and worked over, goes back nevertheless with all its faults to an ancient recension which alone offers the right reading in many places. Mr. Ross builds his text on these three manuscripts and the readings of the ancient commentators. He also accepts subsidiary aid from the Latin version of William of Moerbeke (saec. XIII). But there still remain passages in which this evidence does not suffice and we are obliged to fall back on the so-called codices deteriores. This had already been recognized by Christ, who was the first to expel thirteen of Bekker's fifteen manuscripts and rely on E and A^b alone. Mr. Ross has followed him here. Practically, this procedure involves little danger. True, an appa-

ratus made on these lines fails to mirror the actual tradition or to present a unitary picture of the textual history. A 'critical edition' of the *Metaphysics* cannot refuse place to the deteriores, any more than an editor of Aeschylus or Sophocles can be found to-day to take his stand solely on the Laurentianus. A reduction of the deteriores to the two traditions mentioned is impossible. Of this I have become convinced in the course of years and especially by a fresh exploration of this group of manuscripts undertaken last spring in Italy. Thus it is hardly open to doubt that the text of the *Metaphysics* has come to us through more than two channels.

The text of a work which, owing to the difficulty of its contents, has been as long neglected by professional scholars as the *Metaphysics*, was bound to gain especially by systematic philosophical interpretation; and I had already shown that emendation based on such interpretation had here a great field. Mr. Ross has not only collected all emendations worth considering contributed since Christ's edition, but has also himself emended the text in many places, especially by the simple means of correct punctuation. The commentary shows at every step the advance on Bonitz. It justifies the text where necessary, explains the connexion of thought, and illuminates by parallels the frequent verbal difficulties. Much here, of course, remains controversial, as is only to be expected with such material. I am not able, e.g., to accept the summary treatment of the problem of the exoteric discourses at 1076a 28. Again, the discussions in Books A M N of the philosophy of numbers present neglected problems which in the meantime have been brought much nearer to a solution by Julius Stenzel's book *Zahl und Gestalt bei Plato* (Leipzig, 1924): this affects the detailed interpretation of these books. Stenzel has come closer than his predecessors to the essence of Plato's ideal number by bringing to the front certain aspects of the Greek notion of number somewhat remote from our modern abstraction and developed by Plato with particular emphasis. This throws new light on Aristotle's polemic

against ideal numbers and enables one to appreciate historically the Aristotelian 'discovery' which is so apt to-day to seem a mere platitude.

The comprehensive Introduction contains in 166 pages, in addition to the discussion of the manuscripts, chapters on the structure of the *Metaphysics*, on Socrates and the Platonic school, on Aristotle's metaphysical doctrine, and on his theology. It is here that the divergence between the tendency of present-day German work and that which Ross's book reflects comes most strikingly to view. Since the time of Eduard Zeller, who still built his picture of Socrates and of the history of thought from Socrates to Aristotle predominantly on the evidence of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, we have reached a pretty general agreement that this evidence can only be used with great caution. It is significant that Aristotle, looking back, could see the sense of the whole development and of its details only by regarding it as the 'pre-history' of his own philosophy. As a main factor in the historical outlook of the time his pronouncements are no doubt important. Yet, if we want to know what Socrates or Plato intended, we cannot possibly accept the extract from the facts which Aristotle gives in his account of them. For this extract is oriented by the philosopher's attitude of historical self-analysis, and is therefore itself a piece of constructive philosophical thought, a transformation of the actuality. The question is not whether this evidence is 'false' or 'correct,' but how to make the distinction between the development as Aristotle from his angle was bound to see it and as it actually was.

It is perhaps only natural in an introduction to the *Metaphysics* to see the picture of the past, as Mr. Ross does, entirely with Aristotle's eyes: further, whole sections of the picture, such as Plato's later philosophy of numbers with its continuation in the Academy, can only be reconstructed from Aristotle's account. But there are wide reaches for which we have also original material in our possession and can therefore construct a richer picture: for Aristotle uniformly spoke with characteristic brevity and to people

whose thought was saturated with these questions. It is however incontestable that we can penetrate much more deeply into the motives of that development than Aristotle's short statements do, and that for our understanding it is precisely those pages of the story that need illumination which to his Greek contemporaries were the least striking. In Germany, stimulated partly by the work of Jackson and other Englishmen, a particularly vigorous effort has been made during the last thirty years to understand Aristotle's historical position as the philosophical successor of Socrates and Plato. Every variety of opinion has had its champions, from the extreme which tears Aristotle and Plato wholly asunder and disbelieves in any organic development of the problems, to the neo-platonic syncretism which reads Aristotle's teaching as merely a clearer statement of Plato's and essentially identical with it. But all tendencies have this in common, that they question Aristotle's evidence, and seek criteria by which to obtain a more objective view of the facts. And this was also the chief goal of the work of Professor Burnet and others on the Presocratics. It is my personal conviction that this line of enquiry, now that it has got over its childish ailments, is beginning to evolve a real understanding of Aristotle's place in the succession, which will do justice to him as well as to Plato and will also show in its true value, without either canonising or cancelling, his own account of himself.

The peculiarity of Mr. Ross's Introduction is that it views Aristotle entirely from within, from the dogma of his system and from his historical conception of himself, not from an external standpoint. In a sense he sees him with the eyes of a latter-day Peripatetic. This applies not only to the historical section: the sketch of the metaphysical doctrine is similarly conceived. It is not a chapter in the history of thought, but is esoteric and doxographical. The first section, 'The Structure of the *Metaphysics*,' in which Mr. Ross explains his attitude to my *Entstehungsgeschichte der Metaphysik*, shows the same careful statement of the results of the philological enquiry

as to redaction, chronology, and composition; but these acquire here no living significance for the inner philosophical structure. The very position of this section, isolated, and parted from the account of the inner framework of the treatise, shows of itself that the two are not intimately related. I tried to show in my last book, *Aristoteles* (Berlin, 1923), that it is not only possible but necessary to bring these together. In that book, from the mere externals, from the story of editorial adjustments and readjustments, I attempted to advance to the proof of an inner development of the philosophical problems themselves.¹ My agreement with Mr. Ross as to the external chronological results leads me to hope that he may recognise, as Professor Taylor has already recognized, the value of these results for the philosophical analysis. That would be a great gain. Philology and philosophy would no longer, as hitherto, persistently pass one another by: they could meet on common ground.

My criticism is constructive in aim. It may possibly produce on readers not specially familiar with the problem the impression that I wish to detract somewhat from the value of the work before me. As against that it must be emphasised that this work—a work showing remarkably industry and keen understanding by an Oxford scholar who has already served Aristotle well—is a thing finished and complete in itself, the importance of which for fellow-students is independent of the particular tendency of their studies. But it appears at a time when Aristotelian studies, after so long standing still on firm ground, are beginning once more to move. Hence interpretation and analysis are in many ways offered new openings, and I had to try to show what questions systematic interpretation should be required to answer from the new position now won. Whether we shall ever get so far as to answer them, no one yet knows; but what we do already know we should not in con-

¹ I am of course aware that Mr. Ross's work must have been practically finished when my *Aristoteles* appeared.

clusion leave unsaid, that even in those future times for which we hope, Mr. Ross's work will still retain in the long succession which begins with the Peri-

patetic commentators the honoured place which we to-day thankfully accord it.

WERNER JAEGER.

THE BUDÉ EURIPIDES, III. AND IV.

Tome III.: *Héracles, Les Suppliantes, Ion*. Tome IV.: *Les Troyennes, Iphigénie en Tauride, Électre*. Texte établi et traduit par LÉON PARMENTIER et HENRI GRÉGOIRE. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1923, 1925.

THE six plays comprised in these volumes belong to what is generally regarded as the middle period of Euripides' art, and are the same as those which Professor Murray included in his second volume. Of these the only one that can be securely dated is the *Troades*, which Aelian's account of the victory of Xenocles (*Var. Hist.* II. 8) enables us to assign to the year 415. There is, however, a consensus of opinion that the *Electra* was produced at the Dionysia of 413, in view of its reference to the Sicilian expedition (1347 f.) and its anticipation of the plot of the *Helena* (1280). But whereas M. Grégoire (p. 106) assigns the *Iphigenia at Tauris* for plausible reasons to 414, Murray refuses to be more precise than to adopt 414-412. Since, however, he admits that the *Electra* belongs to 413, and 412 is occupied by the *Helena*, his practical conclusion is the same as Grégoire's. Similarly in the case of the *Ion*, where indecisive results have been obtained, and Murray confines himself to the remark that metre shows it to be subsequent to the *Heracles*, Grégoire (p. 167), by comparing the mention of Rhion in 1592 with Thuc. 5. 52, makes it probable that the play should be assigned to the year 418. The date of the *Heracles* is very doubtful. M. Parmentier (p. 15) conjectures that the year 424 is the most suitable, and believes that, anyhow, it was prior to the Peace of Nicias. Murray thinks that the *Suppliques* belongs to the time of the Peace, and that the *Heracles* should be placed in close connexion with it—say about 423-420. Here again Gré-

goire is more definite, holding that the *Suppliques* was produced at the Dionysia of 422.

These six plays have been edited and translated by Professor Parmentier of Liège and Professor Grégoire of Brussels, who have collaborated in their critical methods, and have succeeded in producing the appearance of common effort. Parmentier is immediately responsible for the *Heracles*, *Troades*, and *Electra*, and Grégoire for the *Suppliques*, *Ion*, and *Iphigenia*.

I have read with interest the Introductions prefixed to the several plays. They are scholarly in method and lucid in expression, and it deserves to be said that the substance of their contents comprises such matters as are especially required by students of Euripides. Thus, if I may take the *Heracles* as a sample, the editor discusses the reasons why *Heracles* was not a common personage in Tragedy, and points out that his character has been idealised by Euripides. He proceeds to examine the sources of the story and the treatment of them in the play; and deals with the significance of the debate on archery, and its probable bearing on the date of production. Lastly, the question is raised of the relation of the *Heracles* to the *Trachiniae*,¹ and the priority of Sophocles' play is forcibly maintained.

Having only tested the translations where the text is difficult or ambiguous, I am not competent to appraise it, even if it were not impertinent for a foreigner to do so. But the treatment of the text is another matter and deserves careful attention.

With the exception of the *Troades*, where P has the valuable control of V (Vaticanus 909), the plays of this group

¹ But why does M. Parmentier speak of the innocent *Lichas* (p. 5)?

depend entirely upon the evidence of L and P, whose mutual relations are variously estimated. Our editors agree with Wecklein that, so far as these plays are concerned, P is a copy of L; but whereas Wecklein cites the readings of P throughout, Parmentier and Grégoire leave them to be inferred *ex silentio*, and profess only to cite P where L has been corrected subsequently to the copying. In fact, they hold that P contributes nothing which is not or has not been in L. But practice does not always correspond with profession, for in *Suppl.* 456 and 593 P is rightly mentioned as clearness demands. Similarly in *Ion* 52 P is quoted for ἀμφὶ βωμίους, in *Suppl.* 754 for οὐνεκ' ἀγών, and *ib.* 872 for ἄλλην. On the other hand, how is P's reading to be inferred in *ib.* 1049? The French editors made fresh collations of L and P in 1921, but it does not appear that they obtained results to compensate them for the labour involved. Sometimes, indeed, one feels a doubt as to the correctness of the new collation. There is no reference in *Ion* 41 to ἐνιππεύοντος, which is reported both by Wecklein and Murray as the reading of P. It is a more serious matter when P's ἐγώ τε is unrecorded in *Suppl.* 858. In *El.* 170 the new apparatus does not agree with the report of Murray and Wecklein, and in *Suppl.* 456 the editor deliberately corrects Murray.

The attempt to gain space by restricting the method of citation is seldom successful, and it is not solely in their treatment of P that the editors have failed to take this factor into account. I refer especially to the use of the symbol 'rec' to denote equally readings taken from late copies of L and corrections of Byzantine, Renaissance, and modern scholars. Even so, the notation is not carried out consistently. On *El.* 272 (φίλοι σοι) 'rec' stands for Victorius, but elsewhere in the same play (32, 133, 193) the critic is cited by name. Hence frequently, as in *Ion* 70, one must guess the significance of 'rec.'

It should be mentioned that the editors are up to date in recording the variants of the scraps of papyrus which have been recently discovered. Notable examples will be found in *I.T.* 252 and *El.* 373, but there is an error in the

description of Π given for the *I.T.* (p. 84).

I pass on to enumerate certain passages where I am unable to agree with the solution recommended by the editors. These examples are chosen almost at random from amongst the plenitude of material which naturally invites comment. For the text of these plays is often corrupt, and the apparatus to the *Troades* is enough to show how much worse off we may be where there is no similar controlling source. *Ion* 98 cannot be right as it stands; *ib.* 174: Badham's text is given, but without any warning; *ib.* 235: the line should end with μέλα-; *ib.* 300: ἐνσπρέφει seems better, especially with Scaliger's σηκοῖς; *ib.* 354: it is difficult to understand the editor's view, and in the following lines it would be better to omit the tiresome reference, and to state its effect; *Suppl.* 599: the translation of this difficult passage does not elucidate the text; *ib.* 769: was not Kirchhoff right here? *ib.* 876 f.: Stobaeus giving οὐδὲ and παρέσχε is perhaps right (anyhow, the variant οὐδὲ : ὥστε is instructive as perhaps bearing on the correction of Soph. *Trach.* 576); *ib.* 903: perhaps read ἐξευρών; *ib.* 1101: perhaps οὐδ' ἥδιον ἐν; *El.* 383: the editor seeks to defend the reading of the MSS., but, unless I am much mistaken, his references have gone astray (anyhow, οὐ μὴ φρονήσετε cannot possibly mean 'écoutez la raison,' and makes one wonder how (e.g.) he would deal with *Bacch.* 343); *Tro.* 916 ff. is a difficult passage, and Parmentier's remedy—to bracket 918—is unsatisfactory, since some reference to Helen's defence is essential. I still think that τὰ μ' ἰσαίτατ' αἰτιάματα, which I proposed in 1890 (*C.R.* IV. 425), and which seems to have occurred independently to Murray, gives good sense, and is obtained at a minimum cost—merely the alteration of σ to τ, seeing that the confusion of IC and K is notorious.

Misprints or similar slips will be found either in text or notes at *Ion* 85, *ib.* 324, 'Jodrell'; *Suppl.* 367, μεγάλα; *ib.* 553, a comma is required after εὐτυχίῃ; *ib.* 608, εὐτυχία; *ib.* 733, τισάντων; *ib.* 854, αὐ for ἄν; see *cr. n.*; *ib.* 790 and 925: the *cr. nn.* are not complete.

A. C. PEARSON.

DIEHL'S *ANTHOLOGIA LYRICA*.

Anthologia Lyrica. Edidit E. DIEHL. Voll. III.-VI. et supplementum. Vol. III., pp. 111; Vol. IV., pp. 168; Vol. V., pp. 167; Vol. VI., pp. 152; supplementum, pp. 24. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923-1925. Vol. III., M. 2.40; Vols. IV.-VI., M. 3.60 each; supplementum, M. 0.50.

WE always look on with interest when an old and tried companion comes before us in a new suit, and we are delighted if we find that it makes him more attractive and sets off little features that had hitherto escaped our notice. Such is the happy fate of Bergk's *Anthologia Lyrica* after passing through the skilful hands of Hiller, Crusius, and, best and last of all, Diehl, who has now completed his revision and extension of the original work. Picking up the one-volume edition of 1897, subsequently reprinted, but not, as far as I can discover, in any way corrected or revised, we note with satisfaction Diehl's addition of testimonia, critical notes (as in the larger *Poet. Lyr. Gr.*), brief but very useful comments, and many an illuminating parallel from Greek poetry.

We are particularly grateful for the indication of the sources; this is a matter of real importance to every serious scholar. The student pursuing linguistic or metrical game feels much safer if he knows that a grammarian quoted the passage in question for a definite linguistic or metrical purpose; we regard an Ionic form with less distrust if we are certain that an ancient sponsor was himself ready to vouch for its Ionic character. And the context is itself often the shortest and best commentary on the meaning of a fragment. Owing to lack of space Diehl has of course not been able to supply the context, but he gives references, and the reader can accordingly consult the source for himself.

The new material in the text is extensive, and includes the *Persians* of Timotheus, the Ox. Fragm. of Ibycus, Alcaeus, the new Sappho, etc., as well as much that was previously known but not admitted into the earlier issues. Bacchylides, on the other hand, has

disappeared; he is no longer a man to be just 'anthologised,' for after the discoveries in Egypt he has been promoted to the dignity of a Pindar, and is now a poet with 'complete surviving works.'

Modern editors are certainly not lacking in courage or ingenuity, as will be seen if we put side by side the rival versions of a poem by Alcaeus restored by two eminent scholars:

[Φρόντιδὲς μ' ἔχον] αἶ καὶ διανοία[ι],
[τί χρὴ λῶσπον ἀνυσ]σαι χρόνον, ὦ πά[ι].
[τλῆτ' ὦν θασαπε]ρ αὐτος Κρονίδα[ις τέλη]
[ἔων κότερος, δπ]ταί κε θέλη τρ[όπων]
[θνήτα πάντα] κτλ.

Diehl IV., p. 401.

[Τίς γνῶμα σ' ἐσέ]δν καὶ διανοία
[ἃ πόσον τετάρ]και χρόνον, ὦ πά[τρι:]
[θάρα· οὐ φάσε γ]ὰρ αὐτος Κρονίδα[ις χρέων]
[ἔμμεναι σ' Ἄρε] δπ[τα] κέ σ' ἔλη τρέ[μην],
[οὐδ' ἀμφικτιόν] κτλ.

Edmonds, *Lyra Graeca* I., p. 346.

It would make excellent training for future editors if deserving undergraduates were set to reconstruct the original context of small bits of three or four words chosen from each line in a chorus from one of the less-read plays of Aeschylus or Euripides, with a careful indication of the spaces filled by the missing words in some standard edition. The result would be entertaining, and might serve to show how far from inevitable even the best of such restorations may be.

The systematic study of these lyric, iambic, and elegiac fragments would really add to a man's understanding of Greek literature and life, and also help him to appreciate the importance of the less familiar dialects. These handy little volumes are an encyclopaedia of amusement for those who like to spend their odd moments in literary dawdling and to ferret in the accumulated mass of gems and rubbish amid a variety of products, ranging from the exhibits of a high-class bazaar to those of the meanest jumble sales, from the beauties of Sappho, the wise counsels of Solon, the terse maxims of Theognis and the protests of Xenophanes, to the atrocities of Timotheus and the inanities of the freak poems. We plunge into a fascinating medley of screech-owls and swallow-songs, apple-blossoms and

pomegranates, echoes of children at play, peaceful colonists and buccaneers 'ivres d'un rêve héroïque et brutal,' shipwrecks and eclipses, experiments in local idiom, proverbs that stick like a burr, stardust and glimpses of pure ether, and splashes of mud from the gutter in the international argot of

Hipponax, Cain and Villon of the Greeks, in his literary methods a true forerunner of the Goncourt brothers. Of the old and new *Anthologia Lyrica* we can only say: οὐδείς πῶν νέον θέλει παλαιόν· λέγει γάρ, 'Ο νέος χρηστός ἐστίν.

T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS.

GREEK RELIGION.

The Religious Thought of the Greeks. By CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE. Second Edition. Pp. viii + 385. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1925. Price \$4.

A History of Greek Religion. By MARTIN P. NILSSON. Translated from the Swedish by F. J. FIELDEN, with a Preface by Sir JAMES G. FRAZER. Pp. 310. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 12s. 6d.

AGREEABLY and lucidly written with great knowledge and a yet rarer judgment, the lectures of Professor Clifford Moore survey the history of Greek religious thought from Homer through the classical and hellenistic developments up to the conflict of paganism and Christianity. With Farnell's *Outline Sketch of Greek Religion*, for the books are in many respects complementary, it would form an admirable introduction to the study of Greek religion. Both books should be in every school library. The interest of neither is confined to beginners, and the more a reader knows the more he is likely to learn, but their accuracy and lucidity make them particularly valuable as an introduction to the subject. Professor Moore's second edition is a reprint of the first with a few minor additions and corrections; except to give it the hearty welcome which it deserves, no further comment therefore seems necessary.

Professor Nilsson's book is not strictly a systematic history, but a series of lectures which cover the period between the Bronze Age and the decline of the Greek city-state. The obscure problems of the earlier developments claim the lion's share both in scale of treatment and in interest. The author of *Griechische Feste* has, of course, a knowledge of the classical data such as few

can claim; he is also a distinguished anthropologist; as regards folk-tale, very much less important for his purpose, his touch does not seem to me so certain.

By the way, the story told to Lenormant at Eleusis (p. 301) is a folk-tale with maladroit additions. But it is the additions which supply the alleged connexion with antiquity; the tale belongs to a type unknown in classical literature and probably oriental in origin.

This brings me to a complaint. I hope that a second edition will be more exactly documented. Few of us carry even well-known passages of Homer in our heads, and it is tiresome to have to hunt through the poems to find them. The footnotes contain some very useful hints as to books in which further information is to be found (personally I think it an error on p. 225 to suggest Lewis Campbell as a guide if Adam is to be omitted), but there are almost no references to chapter and verse for statements in classical authors. The index to the book could also be improved. Such blemishes may be corrected in the second edition, which is assuredly in store for the most interesting and stimulating book on Greek religion that has for long appeared. Almost every page contains matter for thought, and the lectures are full of illuminating suggestions of the kind which appear obvious once they have been propounded. Naturally in so difficult and problematical a field there is also more which challenges comment or criticism than a reviewer's space may contain.

Perhaps most interesting is the attack upon the general problem of the relation between the Minoan-Mycenaean and classical religions; for it is the first time

that the attempt has been made by a specialist in Greek religion of the first rank. Professor Nilsson works, as on the present evidence he was bound to do, with a racial distinction between Minoan - Mycenaean and invading Greeks. An excellent point is made in emphasising the fact that the centres of Greek heroic legend are all sites of importance in the Bronze Age. What are the right deductions to be drawn, I have not yet made up my mind.

The trouble as regards the general problem is that, directly we get down to detail, perplexities multiply. Take Eleusis, a pre-Greek cult-centre.¹ Eleusis and Elysium are supposed to be non-Greek words. But at the same time we are assured that Demeter is the Corn Mother originating in the corn-sheaf, and 'information of a late date,' supported by an inconclusive vase painting, establishes 'the fact' that reaping an ear of corn in silence was a major rite in the Mysteries. The late authority must be Hippolytus, who is specifically quoted for the formula 'ἱερὸν ἔτεκεν πότνια κοῦρον βριμὸν βριμὸν' (p. 32), but as Farnell has pointed out it is very doubtful if Hippolytus is to be trusted in either case. But, if we let that pass, why is Demeter's name Greek? Again, Persephone or Phersephassa is 'pre-Grecian mistress of the kingdom of the dead' (p. 212). I think the reader would understand from Nilsson's text that the identification of Kore and Persephone is pre-Homeric. But then the ignoring of it by Homer, if not inexplicable, is at least curious. About the existence of a Mycenaean city-goddess, prototype of Athena Polias, I am still not sure. I do not think her sufficiently well established to form the basis of further argument. On the other hand, I see much more of the Minoan nature-goddess in Artemis than does Professor Nilsson. No doubt the association of Artemis with the nymphs helped to

mould the popular and poetic conception of her, but that in origin she is solely a 'projection,' if that is the word, of the group of nymphs I doubt. And since we are given the analogy Pan, Panes, and Silenus, Silenoi, one is tempted to ask for the corresponding plural in the case of Artemis.

I have not personally been convinced either by Wilamowitz or by *Primitive Time Reckoning* that Apollo was an immigrant from Asia Minor. He is here bracketed with Dionysos as a distinguished alien of pre-Homeric date. It should have been added that, though Dionysos was not unknown to Homer, his importance in the Homeric pantheon is negligible and his rise to power must therefore be post-Homeric. The story of Lycurgus and the maenads is treated, perhaps rightly, as a reminiscence of hostility to the new religion. In all these stories, however, there are two perhaps inextricable strands; for there is also an aetiological element. The pursuit of the nurses of the god by Lycurgus is very like the ritual of the Agrionia at Orchomenus, and was the 'ox-smiter' of Lycurgus perhaps the sacrificial axe rather than an ox-goad, as it is usually translated? In this connexion I am glad to find Nilsson confirming an unpublished view, to which I had independently come, that there are very slender grounds for connecting the Cretan *labrys* with thunder, and that it is much more probably the instrument of sacrifice.

As regards hero-worship I should emphasise and perhaps express differently the passage on p. 103, and deprecate the view that the cult of heroes is rooted in a general worship of the dead. I do not believe that there is a scrap of evidence that there was any general cult of the dead in the Bronze Age. In Egypt, it will be remembered, immortality was first the prerogative of the Pharaohs, then it spread to the nobility as well, and ultimately to all Egyptians. Very similar is the development of astral theories of immortality in the Hellenistic age; apotheosis is first confined to the good and great, but gradually extends its scope. In the Bronze Age I believe that apotheosis was still

¹ Of course Nestor's ring will now be brought into play. It may be worth pointing out that, even if Evans' interpretation is in the main correct, there is still no remarkable connexion between griffin-headed females dragging an initiate or a soul to an enthroned griffin and any known ritual at Eleusis.

confined to kings or nobles, and in a sense hero-worship was hero-worship from the beginning. Nor do I believe that Greek hero-cult is primarily apotropaic (p. 194). Far more convincing is the inconsistent but brilliant suggestion that one reason for the remarkable development of hero-worship in post-Homeric Greece was the fact that gods had become universalised, while heroes had strictly local loyalties and were therefore more suitable divine champions in inter-state competition. The word hero, of course, underwent gradual degradation in popular usage until in the fifth century it came to mean the spirit of a dead man or malevolent ghost. On p. 100 Nilsson robs an Aristophanic joke of its point. It was not a popular belief that the ghost of Orestes walked at night in Athens, but rather that 'heroes,' in the degraded sense, did so. Aristophanes chose the particular hero because of his namesake the foot-pad. On p. 140 I should like some real evidence of the existence of revenants in classical belief (that given by Lawson does not bear scrutiny) before tracing its origin to the period before the introduction of cremation.

As regards the sanctuary upon Mount Juktas (p. 12), it may be pointed out that no archaeological evidence is given in the *Palace of Minos* to justify the assumption that the buildings are not secular, as their shape and character would naturally suggest them to be. The votive objects apparently occur only in the ash stratum below them, i.e., M.M.II.

It is always being repeated (but is it true?) that Delphi consistently opposed tyrannies (p. 198). To the Pisistratidae no doubt the oracle was hostile and the Alcmaeonidae could have told us why, but one thinks, for example, of the oracle's relations with Periander or Cylon, or of the source of many of its choicest *objets d'art*, and becomes a little sceptical of its alleged hostility to tyrants as such.

Was the origin of the scourging at the shrine of Orthia really the desire to bring the Maypole or the sacred bough into beneficent contact with the patient (p. 94)?

But it would be possible to go on indefinitely challenging points of interest where they so richly abound. It is long since I have read a book from which I have learned so much.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

STAGES OF GREEK RELIGION.

Five Stages of Greek Religion. By GILBERT MURRAY. Pp. 276. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 10s. 6d. WITH regard to the first two of these lectures *pictas* towards the teacher to whom my personal debt is incalculable, is in conflict with honesty. I may be wrong, but they seem to me fantastic and calculated to give a completely wrong idea of the nature of Greek religion. The speculations in *Saturnia Regna* are based not upon facts but upon a series of wild hypotheses most of which are by now discredited, and there is some indication that Professor Murray is here off his field and has not really mastered what is known for certain about the material. For example, the Mycenaean shield actually is not two round shields stuck together, still less two 'thunder shields' as they become in a second passage.

However, for good or ill, readers of the C.R. are likely to have formed their opinion of the Four Stages, which remain in substance unaltered. They will remember that the last two dealt with Hellenistic religion and the attempted revival of paganism by Julian. Here Professor Murray's peculiar gifts for the sympathetic interpretation of literature find fairer scope. These lectures were and remain suggestive and valuable, whether one agrees with them in every particular or not. Particularly useful, for the text is only accessible in Mullach, is the translation of Sallustius *De Diis et Mundo*. The unwary may be cautioned that the Antiochus I. (p. 178) is not Soter, as the phrasing might suggest, but Epiphanes of Commagene (69-34 B.C.). Some justification is surely needed for still speaking of the Parisian magical papyrus as a Mithraic

liturgy. I cannot find in Dieterich's edition of it the exhortation with which it is said (p. 186) to end. The new chapter belongs to the good, not to the bad, half of the book. It sketches with the author's practised and eloquent charm the origin of the Cynic, Stoic, and Epicurean schools. I personally feel that the active side to Epicureanism, a mission to make other men happy, is stated more strongly than the facts warrant. Matters of detail are sometimes provocative. Perhaps the characterisation of Plato's criticism of democracy as 'affectionate' is deliberately so. By a curious slip, twice repeated, the Peloponnesian War is here brought to an end by the battle of Kynoskephalai.

That Greeks in general felt that the *polis* had failed with the fall of Athens seems to me dubious. Of course the outside world saw a defeat of Hellenism in the fall of the Athenian empire, but precisely because the Athenian empire was a larger and more powerful political unit than a *polis*. Brutal facts had doomed the city-state in the struggle for survival from the moment that the patriot states realised that they could not oppose Persia without forming some larger combination. Unfortunately, the Greek world generally did not realise it even in the fourth century, nor, notoriously, did Aristotle while his pupil was conquering the world.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

THE INFLUENCE OF PLATONISM.

Platonism and its Influence. By A. E. TAYLOR. Pp. x+158. London, etc.: Harrap. 5s. net.

THIS book reviews the influence which Platonism has exercised on all later times, largely through the medium of Christian theology. The first chapter traces the channels through which it has flowed; the other three chapters are devoted to the principles of science, the rule of life, and the theology of Plato. Few scholars (and I am not one of them) are competent to criticise a work showing such mastery of the whole tradition of Western theology and philosophy. Its value is fortunately unaffected by Professor Taylor's

peculiar view of the Socratic contributions to Platonism. There is perhaps a slight tendency to modernise some parts of the Platonic doctrine. It is not enough to say that what is 'really meant' by the doctrine of Reminiscence is that sense experience suggests to us the forms by exhibiting a series of more remote or closer approximations to an ideal limit (p. 36). If this were all, Reminiscence would have no bearing on the question of immortality. But such reservations are of little importance. Every Platonist will be deeply grateful for this lucid and comprehensive survey.

F. M. CORNFORD.

GREEK PROPER NAMES.

Introduction à l'Étude critique du Nom propre grec. Fasc. I-III. By C. AUTRAN. Pp. 240. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1925. Price 20 frs. per fasc.

UP till now there has been no systematic study of Greek place-names. Sundwall's *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier*, which is an indispensable introduction to the subject, deals only with a corner of the field, and other works, such as Fick's *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*, are scrappy and uncritical. Person-names have received more

attention, but, so far, there has been no attempt to utilise in the study of the subject the vast amount of material that has accumulated, mainly from Western Asia, during the last twenty or thirty years; and from the linguistic standpoint Fick-Bechtel and Pape-Benseler are equally antiquated. For this reason there was need of such a work as M. Autran's, where the facts and theories of the geographer, the orientalist, the Egyptologist, and the linguist have been collected with enormous industry. The first fasci-

culus of this work is devoted to a somewhat verbose exposition of the principles which, M. Autran conceives, must guide the study of Greek names; the second and third give us the first instalment of the place-names from 'Αβαι to 'Ηλεκτρον. Each Greek name is accompanied in parallel columns by 'homologues' from Asia Minor, Italy, and other parts of the Mediterranean world, and footnotes of the kind we expect from the author of *Tarkondemos* furnish a detailed commentary.

M. Autran's view that Greek names, like the Greek vocabulary in general, preserve a considerable pre-hellenic, non-indogermanic element, will, of course, be accepted without question. There will also be general agreement with what he says (p. 57 f.) on the necessity of recognising that the Greek alphabet was often used to represent sounds unknown to its inventors, and that, therefore, we must be prepared for apparent phonetic irregularities. His remarks, too, on the subject of the relationship of languages (p. 61 f.) are very sound. It is becoming clearer day by day that the orthodox views (or the views lately orthodox) on this subject must be modified. In his detailed discussion of the Greek name ('Le Paradoxe du Nom propre grec,' p. 1 ff.), however, M. Autran definitely takes leave of common sense. There is a certain number of names, mostly consisting, so far as we know, of one term, like *Achilles*, *Odysseus*, which have their pre-hellenic character clearly stamped upon them. Compound names, on the other hand, are indogermanic in form. They may, it is true, be adaptations or translations (a possibility with which M. Autran does not reckon) of pre-hellenic names, but it is difficult to see how this could be proved. M. Autran argues at great length that, because *Πολυνείκης* would appear to be a name of ill omen, the elements *Πολυ-* and *νείκης* have nothing to do with the Greek *πολύ* and *νείκος*. But the name, for all we know, may be purely literary; in any case, it is a transparent formation of indogermanic type, and to that

extent it is an indogermanic name. That it may have been based, by way of adaptation or translation, on a pre-hellenic name is a supposition that might interest psychologists, but has no direct bearing on Greek onomastic from the linguistic side. On p. 39, 'Αρποκράτης is explained as a phonetic adaptation of an Egyptian phrase, and on p. 40 it is said to be absurd to identify the first element in *Πολύαρχος* with the Greek *πολύ*. If it were known for a fact that the first bearers of these and similar names had been members of a community which did not speak an indogermanic language, we might infer, reasonably enough, that these names were adaptations or translations of non-indogermanic names; but we should, at the same time, insist that they were, formally, good indogermanic names. The case of such names as the Latin *Manilius* or the English *James*, which are not formally indogermanic, is quite different; here a foreign origin is self-evident. For compound Greek names, on the other hand, the assumption of foreign evidence must rest on concrete historical evidence.

M. Autran is not a comparative philologist, and his etymologies often will not bear close examination. The comparison of *Γαδεῖρα* with 'Irish' *cader* is not convincing, because the 'Irish' *cader* does not exist. Etruscan *puini* is equated (p. 91, n. 1) with Sanscrit *paṇi-* 'merchant,' but the character of the nasal in the Sanscrit word, alone, shows that this is impossible. It is rightly pointed out (p. 96, n. 1) that the name of *Athena* must be pre-hellenic, but the etymology suggested (*ib.* n. 3) can only be described as preposterous. It is not clear that *atanña* is a native Lycian name, though the suffix is Lycian and 'Aegean'; the word may be simply the Greek *Ἀθήναι* 'lycianised.'

As a collection of material, M. Autran's work promises to be extremely useful, but his linguistic speculations will require to be severely controlled.

J. FRASER.

MENANDER'S EPITREPONTES.

Menander: Das Schiedsgericht (Epitrepontes). Erklärt von U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. Pp. vii+219. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1925. 9 G.M.

THIS admirable book is far more than an edition of the *Epitrepontes*. Besides the complete text of that play, with a full commentary and a verse translation, it includes an excellent introduction, and a very interesting chapter upon the art of Menander. There is nothing startling in Wilamowitz's treatment of the papyrus and parchment material. Like most recent editors he accepts both Petersburg II and Z, and assigns the former, in the usual way, to the last scene of the first act, the latter to the opening of the fourth. In discussing the structure of the play he does not consider the possibility that an interval of one night elapses between Acts II. and III. This has not, I think, been suggested, but is supported by the repetition of *αὔριον* (ll. 197 and 198) at the close of Act II. Wilamowitz admits (as Menandrian) such an interval in the *Heautontimorumenos*. With regard to the lost portions, the most striking point is his firm conviction that the opening scene was followed by the appearance of a god, as in the *Perikeiromene*, the *Heros*, the *Florentine Comedy*, and some of the lost plays. It must be admitted that the facts are so complicated that the audience can scarcely have learnt them all, at an early point, by any other method, but the *Epitrepontes* (as Wilamowitz maintains) is a work of Menander's maturity, and certainly later than the *Perikeiromene* at least. Seeing that none of Terence's Menandrian plays has the divine prologue, the matter can hardly be treated as beyond dispute. It seems, however, very likely that Wilamowitz is right: if so, the suggestion may be hazarded that Terence deliberately avoided such models, and this may help to account for the fact, which surprises Wilamowitz (p. 142), that Terence uses none of the plays included in any known Greek selection of Menander. The general discussion of the function and antecedents of the

divine prologue is excellent, and Leo's attempt to prove the existence in Greece of Terentian prologues is effectively criticised.

The section of the introduction devoted to masks and costumes is slight, and in the matter of stage architecture the views adopted have been severely shaken by the recent work of Armin von Gerkan at Priene.

Of the new readings the most attractive is perhaps *σὺν δ' ἐγὼ* (with Capps' *συνέπαιζε*) in l. 261. There are many other interesting suggestions, but it is not clear that gaps have been systematically measured. Of the illustrative notes an excellent example is that on l. 142, a discussion of oaths, which has the rare quality of Neil's best work on the *Knights*.

Wilamowitz insists that the *Hecyra* (as Sidonius saw) is a palpable imitation of the *Epitrepontes*, and concludes that Terence is closely following Apollodorus, whose play, like the *Captivi*, illustrates the serious trend of post-Menandrian comedy. Such views (not, of course, new) form a timely corrective to Norwood's chapter on the *Hecyra* in *The Art of Terence*, where the *Epitrepontes* is not mentioned, and the very features which Apollodorus has borrowed from Menander are described as 'totally new' in Terence. On the general question of Terence's relation to his models, however, Wilamowitz is cautious, and he does not venture to use his plays, as wholes, for evidence of Menander's handling. Hence he can compare the detailed structure of the *Epitrepontes* only with that of the *Perikeiromene*, of which he gives an interesting analysis. The '*Samia*' (whose right to that name he repeatedly denies) he considers too imperfect for general discussion. He attacks the theory that the arbitration-scene in the *Epitrepontes* is an imitation of Euripides' *Alope*.

The best parts of the book are perhaps the discussion of Menander's language and style, and the analysis of the characters of the *Epitrepontes*. Of these characters he regards only the cook as a merely typical figure. He

draws admirable distinctions between the three male slaves, and shows convincingly that Smicrines is a real individual, though occasionally degraded by Menander for the satisfaction of the gallery. Best of all is his charming account of Habrotonon. The least satisfactory passages deal with Pamphile, 'die in der Enge der wohlzogenen attischen Jungfrau und der trübseligen Vereinsamung ihrer Ehe kaum ein Wort wagt.' This hardly does justice to her reported resistance to her father, and it is not confirmed by the surviving scraps of their dialogue, especially the opening of ΖΙ,

ἀλλ' εἰ με σφύζων τοῦτο μὴ πέλσας ἐμὲ
οὐκέτι πατήρ κρῖναι' ἄν ἀλλὰ δεσπότης

—lines as antithetical as Syrus'—

οὐχ εὐρεῖς τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀλλ' ἀφάλειος

which he labels 'rhetorisch in vollem Gegensatz zu dem komischen Stil' (p. 64) and deliberately 'unmenandrisch' (p. 158). Nor does he comment upon the tragic rhythm of this part of ΖΙ, which forms a parallel to the *anagnorisis* in the *Perikeiromene*, of which he writes (p. 152), 'Ich kenne keine Analogie und vermag mich an die Disharmonie des Stiles nicht zu gewöhnen.' He seems also, in his anxiety to deny that the *Epitrepontes* was a *drame à thèse*, to minimise unduly the significance of Charisius' attitude towards

Pamphile (p. 126), though later (p. 162) he classes the *Epitrepontes* as one of the plays 'welche im Grunde recht ernsthafte Probleme behandeln.'

With regard to style, he rightly emphasises the realism of the language, and the absence of misplaced rhetoric: the whole of this section deserves careful study. The translation is very readable: I am not competent to say more.

In conclusion, it need scarcely be said that here, as always, Wilamowitz's vast and humane learning illuminates countless aspects of his theme. The book is full of admirable comments upon Greek and Roman comedy, and upon much besides, and it has some engaging personal touches. He admits that in one point he dare not trust his judgment, because his schoolmasters, not content with casting him for Maskarill in a performance of Lessing's *Schatz*, improved the occasion by putting the class through the *Trinummus*. His diffidence is needless, for most lovers of Plautus will echo his words, and not least the implied admiration for the bulk of that great playwright's work: 'In ihm langweilt man sich selbst bei Plautus, und es ist nur die zopfige Zimmerlichkeit, die den Trinummus bevorzugt, weil er dezenter und tugendhafter scheint.'

D. S. ROBERTSON.

HELLENISTIC POETRY.

Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos. Von U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. Two vols. Vol. I., pp. vii + 244; Vol. II., pp. 338. Berlin: Weidmann, 1924.

In his preface Professor von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff expresses the hope that, though no longer able to enter upon new paths, he may yet succeed in moving forward a step on the old. His confidence will certainly seem justified to those who peruse these two volumes, the first of which contains an account of the Hellenistic 'background,' discerning notices of the various poets, and by far the best appraisal of Callimachus which has yet been written, while the second supplies us with a

series of 'interpretations' of Callimachus' *Hymns* and other productions of the Alexandrians and their Roman imitators. How impossible it is to deal with the points and problems raised by such a work within the limits of a review will be clear from a brief summary of its contents. Vol. I. is divided into three sections. In the first of these the author begins his description of the Hellenistic world with a series of brilliant character-sketches of the leading Diadochi, justifying this procedure by the assertion that the age and its tendencies were largely determined by the characters of a few great men. Here perhaps he exaggerates, but in view of the results the reader

will not quarrel with the plea. Pp. 40-90 deal generally with the political and social condition of the Greek world during this period. They contain many illuminating remarks (e.g. on 'Asiatic Prose,' pp. 53-55), but the account suffers from compression; and such a statement as that on p. 82, that Hellenistic poetry exhibits few traces of love towards women, is surely more than paradoxical. Much truer is the remark on p. 89 that the age is romantic rather than sentimental. Part 2 of this volume (pp. 91-151) is perhaps the least interesting portion of the work. The author describes the fate of classical prose and poetry in the Hellenistic Age, and reviews the achievements of the earlier Alexandrians—in particular the Epigrammatists—and their forerunners like Antimachus. He certainly adds some new touches to the traditional account; but, after all, has he not said himself in his preface: 'Bei Leuten, die sich gebärden, als wüssten wir über Antimachos oder Philitas Bescheid, kann ich nichts lernen'? Part 3 contains first (pp. 152-169) an account of Alexandria, its population, the Museum, etc., then (pp. 169-218) an extremely interesting article on Callimachus. Here again one may disagree with some statements about Callimachus' life—e.g. with those made on p. 171¹—but no one has written with greater

insight about the poet's temperament and literary ideals. The comparison with Voltaire and the remarks which precede it are particularly good. It is useful, too, to have here an account of the new discoveries, such as the *Arsinoe* and the *Victory of Sosibius*, though the author's dating of the latter seems very disputable.² There are also brief notices of Lycophron, Aratus, and Apollonius, which are all worth careful study. The volume concludes with a short account of the later Hellenistic Age and the Roman imitators. Here the remarks on Propertius are the most valuable.

The contents of the second volume are even more varied and detailed than those of the first. There are sections on Callimachus, various epigrams, Theocritus, Lycophron, Apollonius, Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*, Aratus, Catullus' Hellenistic poems, and the *Copa*. In dealing with some of these writers—e.g. Lycophron, Cleanthes, Aratus—the author selects a passage and gives us a model of a commentary; for others he supplies a more general analysis. Most important are his elucidations of Callimachus' *Hymns* (pp. 1-87) and the long section on Apollonius (pp. 165-256), where he tackles the thorny question of Apollonius' relation to Callimachus as regards the Argonautic myth.

Clearly these two volumes constitute a work which those who are curious about Alexandrian poetry will long have occasion to consult:

δὴ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ
ὥνῃ τοὺς Μουσέων πάντας ἔεισε κάλους.

E. A. BARBER.

¹ Need Tzetzes' phrase (νεανίσκος τῆς αἰλῆς) refer to C.'s first position at Court (of which incidentally we know nothing)? Is it conceivable that C., while engaged at the library, was enrolled in the Royal Corps of νεανίσκοι for purposes of pay? Another remark of Tzetzes (νεανίαι ἦσαν Καλλιμάχου καὶ Ἐρατοσθένους), and the famous ἐφηβον ἐνὶ οὐρα in the *Vit. Apollon.*, may perhaps have the same application.

² Cf. *Class. Rev.* XXXIX. (1925) 1-2, p. 30.

COLLECTANEA ALEXANDRINA.

Collectanea Alexandrina. Edidit JOHANNES U. POWELL. Pp. 252. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 28s. net.

IN his preface Mr. Powell defines his work as a collection of the remains of Alexandrine poets, Epic, Elegiac, Lyric, and Ethic (323-146 B.C.), with the exception of those of whose work much remains; but he does not restrict him-

self unduly. The poet on p. 76 is (Platt) as late as Nonnus; there are fragments of Apollonius Rhodius and Callimachus (p. 194: so Blass); and an Epimetrum contains new fragments of earlier Epic writers. On the other hand one misses writers like Parthenius and Macho, who, whatever their date, seem to fit in better with pp. 1-176 than many of the semi-literary and

sometimes semi-metrical writings which follow. His second purpose, which is to group together many writers published hitherto in inconvenient form or in obsolete and rare books, including almost all new poetical fragments, he has accomplished with a marvellous completeness. In doing so he makes many helpful suggestions, and his criticism of the texts is sound and scholarly. One notices, for instance, διαπομπεύουσα in Hermesianax 7. 19; the supplements of *Ep. Adesp.*, p. 73, v. 13, and p. 77, v. 34; two corrections of Isyllus, vv. 47 and 60, which he should have placed in the text; suggestions on Philodamus, vv. 126 and 138; a quite certain emendation in [Cercid.] 17. 27; an excellent suggestion on Cercid. 8. 13;¹ the best suggestion to date (p. 232) for Phoenix 1. 4: δὲ οὐκὶ διόδους ἀστέρων ἐδίξητο; νύμφη=νύμφη in *Lyr. Adesp.* 189; some very able criticism on the text of [Mesomedes] p. 198; and a most excellent correction of a fragment (p. 251) of Choerilus or Samius, and another (p. 250) of Antimachus VI. There are, of course, many other excellent readings, some of which will be noted below. For three reasons—for the completeness of the work, for a most diligent study of all relevant publications, and for Mr. Powell's own acute, though somewhat shy, scholarship—everyone will feel deeply grateful. The course rightly taken by the editor of *Liddell and Scott* in treating this as a standard book renders it indispensable; at the same time it may perhaps encourage the reviewer to append to these inadequate encomia a somewhat searching criticism of possible errors.

A defect which strikes even a dabbler in these authors is that Mr. Powell has neglected throughout to consult the papyri which are preserved within easy reach of Oxford. Neither he nor Mr. Scott (despite 'nuper recensuit,' p. 179) have gone as far even as the British Museum. The effect is that a large number of suggestions on these and other writers are merely waste of ink and paper. Again, can Mr. Powell really suppose that any purpose is

served by Cr.'s notes on the remaining letters of *fr. A* of the *Boy and Cock*, pp. 182-183? Why should not [πολι] be ἀπολιπών or ἐπ' ὀλίγῃ or anything else? Why should he on p. 195 give E. Maas' wholly unmetrical supplements in which he does not believe? And why on p. 141 print a restoration of v. 15 of which the first portion is untranslatable—[γλώσσαν ᾗ] would serve—and the second half, as he recognises on *Limenius* 29, unmetrical; as

indeed is —|| πὼν πᾶγον. || Ἦν in v. 7?

The instances given above are only of such supplements as should deceive no one. But there are many cases where Mr. Powell on a smaller scale accepts very doubtful suggestions. In [Callim.] p. 194 why ποτ <τ> ἄς ἱερὰς (which is unmetrical) rather than ποτ' ἀστέρας (which fits the space better: see facs.)? καὶ τίχ' ἀμπυρίξ[ας despite the accent may be καὶ τὸν ἀμπυρίξ (= χὼ ἐμπ.). Why ἐπὶ ῥαδ[ῖς] rather than ἐπ' ῥαδ[ῖς]? Why ἔρριψαν αὐθι δ' rather than ἔρριψαν αὐθι δ'...? Till the subject is known these and other readings here are quite uncertain. I fancy we have a fable interpreted in *maiorum poetarum gloriam*. One other instance will suffice. In Philodamus (p. 166, v. 36) why ῥῆ[ας δ' ὄρ]μον, which you cannot open, rather than (e.g.) οἶμον, which you can (Pind. P. V. 108)? And in v. 26 why χειρὶ πάλων δ[έρ]ας? You cannot brandish a fleece. You can only brandish a spear, for which δόρας (nom. of δόρατος) is quite good Alexandrine, like δοῦρας, or a sham one like the νάρθηξ: e.g. ἀρτιθα]λὲς δ[όρ]ας. Elsewhere Mr. Powell is vague on matters of dress. Euphorion 46: φοιταλέος . . . κοθόρνῳ (where read ἄλῃ for ἄδην?) can only refer to Dionysus, and should come after *fr.* 18. Nor can you (Philetas 17) have a ῥάμμα (for κόμμα) of withies, nor do you wear a ῥάμμα round your waist. The ancients frequently used their girdles of leather for other purposes and broke or lost them; the beggar cut a withy instead: κλήμα that is. There are other cases in which Mr. Powell has been misled. Few will suppose that birds do or ever did creep (*Simmias, fr.* 24); ἔρπει, which is mere

¹ E.g. οὐ[χ] τὸν εἰς ἀρετὰν [καὶ τὰταραχῶν (the last seven letters with Powell)]-δὲς ἰχνεύεις ἀλλὰ.

dittography, has displaced (*e.g.*) ἄσσει. And why write the imperfect here, any more (*e.g.*) than in *Hermesianax* 7. 4? Mr. Powell is neither tailor nor sailor; he deserts a certain correction of his own in *Ap. Rhod.*, *fr.* 9, in order to allow Professor Murray to caulk the timbers of his boat with πομπίλοι. Nor shall he (*p.* 192, *Lyr. Adesp.* 20) moor any craft of mine off the coast just outside a safe fresh-water anchorage. Read *e.g.* λεπτολίθων [δι' ὁρῶ]ν—cairns of small stones being set to mark the channel. In *v.* 8 of the same poem παῦε is meaningless, and παραπροιών a vox nihili (read *e.g.* χῶμα) πάρα πρ.). A little more knowledge of bee-keeping (and of the freedom with which the Alexandrines used compounds) would have led Mr. Powell (*p.* 185) to excise all mention of the inane theory that λιπόκεντροι can mean other than 'leaving behind their stings' (*v.* 15). Perhaps the bees are not πηλουργοί, but πτελεουργοί (*Ar.* 623b 29: coined from ἀνθεμουργός; they used the resin to wax the floors of their hives). Moreover, they are not ἀσκεπεῖς (which is unmetrical), but their honey is ἀσκηθές [τὸ] according to Antimachus. These are trifling flaws. There are few serious errors. Among these must be classed the suggestion on [Alcman] *p.* 186 that these verses are part of an Anthology (where is the lemma?); on *p.* 209 (*fr.* 7. 3 of Cercidas) that variants are not recorded in the margin (is δλεθρον a gloss on πλέθρον and is σπ]ανιοψιάδα a gloss?); and on *p.* 184, where he mistakes μὴ κροῦε, 'stop knocking,' for μὴ κρούσης. In reality there is no 'Marissaeum melos'; there are two fragments: (*a*) metrical (as Garrod saw), *vv.* 1-6, in which Joseph speaks 1, 5, and 6, and Potiphar's wife 2-4 (ὅττι <μοι>σοῦ θοιμάτιον κείται ἐνέχυρα); (*b*) 7 and 8—probably prose—Romeo and Juliet. In [Cercid.] 18. 17 Mr. Powell has been lured into a grave metrical error by a discreetly anonymous Oxonian.

Mr. Powell is throughout somewhat hampered by his addiction to correction *ex ductu literarum*. On *p.* 4 (*Nicaeetus* 7) he actually follows Jacobs and Meineke in seeking an emendation to explain the variants in *v.* 4 of δόμος

(which is correct) and μέγας, already seen to be a variant (probably correct) of ταχύς in *v.* 1. Yet in *v.* 2 you have the variants καλόν, σοφόν, and χρηστόν. Where the sense is the same it is hard to detect such errors: but it is doubtful if Euphorio in 44. 4 wrote ζῶν when he meant ψυχόν: 'he breathed his last as the surge ἐκάλυφεν ὀδόντας.' When the error is by false suggestion correction is easy, as in Rhianus, *fr.* 1 (*p.* 10), *v.* 10, ἐπιλήθεται οὐνεκα γαῖαν ποσσὶν ἐπιστείβει . . .; *v.* 13, κεφαλὴν δ' ὑπὲρ ἀστέρας ἴσχει (for αὐχένας: Meineke's reading is wholly un-Greek). Further, Mr. Powell appears to recognise insufficiently the probability of errors in the order of words, and many of the following suggestions are based on this: *Ap. Rhod.*, *fr.* 10, Δωτιάδος πρότεροι κάμον ἐργάται Αἴμ. Euphorio, *fr.* 50, *v.* 1, τῶν ὅσα τ' ἦρι; *v.* 2, ἡ ποίη ἡ φύλλον ὅτε <φ> ἐχρίμψατο. *Fr.* 126: Tzetzes read καὶ 'χεῖρ <α θ>' ἵπποδ., whence χέρα θ' ἵππ. The MS. tradition of Tzetzes is unmetrical. Eratosthenes, *fr.* 22, 'τράγον Hiller.' No: conj. by Soter (1535). Doubtless Eratosthenes wrote on the game in an aside 'non aliam ob culpam.' Much of his diction is preserved in Herod. *Mime* VIII. + Nonnus. *Fr.* 23, ἄστεα καὶ? Philetas, *fr.* 3, πωλοῦμαι; *fr.* 25, *v.* 2, προυνεῖκοισιν (Headlam). *Hermesianax* 7, *v.* 62, καὶ πάντων μῖσος κτώμενον, ὀξύχολον; *v.* 72, πάσης (a sine qua non) for ταύτης; *v.* 76, θρήσαν for θήκαν; *v.* 98 (where Powell alone attempts to preserve the style), οὐ βαιὸς δ' ἐξεφόρησ' ἄνεμος (with variants -ον, -φ, -εῖτο: 'cast high and dry'—preserving the metaphor of *v.* 95). Simmias, *fr.* 1. 7: transfer δονάκεσσιν and ἐλά<τ>αῖσιν, reading χλωροῖσι. Early editors wrongly

desired to avoid ἐπηρεφέας ἑλάτ/αισι. *Fr.* 11, ἄμὰς Τ. τε καὶ Ἴγν. [ἐφν ἡ] ἄλυκῇ ζάψ; 26, *v.* 16, βλαχαί (or ᾗ) δ' οἶον . . .; *v.* 20 (see on 25. 11) τὰς δὴ, 'Ρόδιος κλυτὸς Ἰσα θεοῖς μεμῶς ποσὶ πολ. . . Alex. Aet. 4. 3, τρεῖς ἦνεσεν <εἵκοσι>, remembering its own poet Hipponax (*fr.* 18, χρυσοῦ στατήρας ἐξήκοντα). Isyllus, *v.* 39, φάτις ὧδε γάρ. V. 46, Φλεγύα δ' ἐκγένετ' Αἰγύλα [δ' ὀνομάσθη]: for which *e.g.* θυγατήρ οἱ. V. 67, ἦλυθε for ἦλθεν. Aristonous

(p. 163), v. 29, παλαιῶν χαρίτων χάριν? P. 173, πίστιν Ῥωμαίων σέβομεν τὰν μετὰ λευ<γαλέαν νύκτ' ἔστιν ὁρῶντας ἂν λευ>κοτάταν or the like. P. 186 8(b) was once ψυχῇ δ' ἐρῶντος λαμπάδιον ὡς ὑπ' ἀνέμου. P. 190, fr. 14, is unmetrical: ὕ. σ. θ. 15, πέλλα γάρ. 19, v. 5, τὰν δορί σώματα κειρομέναν, 'shorn of her people.' 21. v. 6, στέφειν: Mr. Powell is editing Greek, not German. Fr. 37, v. 2, φείσαι [δέ] διαφρονεῖν. Cercidas 4. 51 e.g. κα[τά]ϊξάντεγ- (or π, ποί σ) [-ερόντος σάλου φν]σητόν (or -ατόν). Epimetrum 1 (VI.), p. 250, λαίφεισι δ' ἐ<ν> λινέοις.

After making these criticisms it is incumbent to recognise that Mr. Powell has done a very great deal in every way, but especially on the metrical side, for

the authors he has studied. His own views and those of others are stated throughout with extreme simplicity and in excellent and very readable Latin; his taste is never at fault; and his proof-reading of the book is excellent. The get-up varies somewhat with the editions on which he bases his work; and on the technical side the proof-readers of the Oxford Press have been unwontedly lax in passing letters badly cut (or from wrong founts) and faulty alignments. But to those of us who can spare little time in libraries this collection will be an immense boon, and Mr. Powell deserves our most sincere thanks. If in his ensuing volume he gives us more of himself and less of others we shall be even more grateful. A. D. KNOX.

THE LOEB LUCIAN.

Lucian, Vol. IV. With an English translation by A. M. HARMON. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. vii + 422. London: Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925. IOS.

MR. HARMON has added this further volume to his translation of Lucian, which began to appear in 1913. It contains among other writings the entertaining *Anacharsis*, with its discussion of athletics, the extraordinary account of that superlative knave Alexander of Abironoteichos, the rather dull and sycophantic *Essays in Portraiture* and their defence, and the Herodotean *Goddess of Syria*. The translation, as in the earlier volumes, is vigorous and readable, though with occasional stiffness and some unnecessary colloquialisms, such as 'tremendously staunch,' 'humans,' 'get to be.' The Ionic dialect of the *Syrian Goddess* ('The Goddess of Surrye') has been represented by adopting the style of Sir John Mandeville; but Mandeville is much further removed from contemporary English than Herodotus was from the Greek of Lucian: such sentences as, 'So that oon lyde in gyle,' 'ye, whan thei ne axe not,' and 'he ne may not ligen in no maner bedde un to tyme that his pilgrimage be fulfilled,' serve

rather to demonstrate the ingenuity of the translator than to help the reader, who may be as unfamiliar with Mandeville as with Herodotus, to the meaning of the original.

The translation is fairly close, but at times might be closer without detriment to the flow of the English; for instance, the emphasis on the adjective when its position marks it as predicate might have been more frequently brought out, and sometimes the force of connecting particles in the dialogue might have been more precisely given. On the other hand it may be questioned whether the vocatives ὦ θαυμάσιε and ὦ μακάριε need such special translations as 'you amazing person,' and 'my unsophisticated friend.' Mr. Harmon shows much fertility of resource in varying his rendering of words which recur in different contexts: thus Lucian is very fond of using τραγωδία and cognate words, but Mr. Harmon is always ready for him with such phrases as 'bag of tricks,' 'pomp and circumstance,' 'spectacular career,' 'a part in their show,' 'as they do in the plays.'

A few misprints appear in the Greek text: βεβαιως (p. 44), a full stop for a comma after ἡρξάμην (p. 78), ψυτῶ χρόν for τῷ ψυχρόν (p. 80), ὑκοκριπκήν (p. 180).

A. S. OWEN.

SAPPHO AND HER INFLUENCE.

Sappho and Her Influence. By DAVID M. ROBINSON, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Archaeology and Epigraphy and Lecturer on Greek Literature, The Johns Hopkins University (*Our Debt to Greece and Rome Series*). Pp. 272, with 22 photographic plates. Cm. 19 x 12. Boston, Massachusetts: Marshall Jones Company. 5s. net.

It is one of the drawbacks of a book-series that it seems to be a maxim with publishers that all its volumes should be of the same size. Apart from a critical edition with introduction, translation, commentary, excursuses, and index, all that can be profitably said about Sappho could be got into a hundred pages. Mr. Robinson has filled two hundred and seventy. His enthusiasm and industry are beyond praise. He has accumulated a mass of material—literary, biographical, archaeological—for which any future writer on Sappho will be in his debt. But there is a third ingredient of which his supply was short—critical judgment. And the

resultant dish, to put it brutally, is too much like a bibliography to be a book. It is doubtless mere prejudice that refuses to accept Sappho as one who 'in attending with her whole soul to her business as the poetic and musical caterer for successive weddings upon an ancient and interesting island, incidentally made word-music and created thought-images which, etc.' And we may forgive the writing of such nonsense as 'the wonderful soft sound of the Aeolic Greek,' and the inclusion of a verse-translation involving *Naucratis*. But it is the unkind truth that a professor of literature who talks of 'one of our best American poets,' a Greek scholar who translates γύναιον πορνικόν 'a female harlot,' a writer who ends a chapter of literary appreciation with "'Sappho was incomparably the greatest poetess the world has ever seen'" (Watts-Dunton in ninth ed. *Encyclopædia Britannica*), is not in the best tradition of American scholarship.

J. M. EDMONDS.

GREEK PLAY MUSIC.

Greek Themes in Modern Musical Settings.

By ALBERT A. STANLEY (University of Michigan Studies XV.). Pp. xxiv+386; 10 plates and 24 figures. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924. Cloth, \$4 (also in separate parts).

The Lyric Portions of Iphigenia in Aulis and Iphigenia among the Taurians. Set to music by JANE PEERS NEWHALL (Smith College Classical Studies). Pp. 49. Boston: C. W. Thompson and Co. \$1.50.

MR. STANLEY'S volume contains incidental music for a modern classical play, *Sappho and Phaon*, by Percy Mackaye, for *Alcestis* (in English), *Iphigenia in Tauris* (Greek and English), two Greek fragments (the *Dirge of Sicelus* from Tralles, and the first strophe of the first *Pythian*, set to the themes, of very doubtful authenticity, 'discovered' by Kircher in the seventeenth century), and a symphonic poem, *Attis*. He makes use of simple harmonies,

aiming at a compromise which shall be effective, rather than at archaeological exactitude. The accompaniment is written generally for clarinets, flutes, and harps. The book also includes much information about the dresses worn, the stage arrangements, and the dance-movements at Michigan performances. Our impression is that the music, which shows a certain kinship to that of Dr. Abdy Williams, is pleasing and inoffensive, but not very exciting. Whether on the whole a more modern treatment is not better than an inexact compromise is disputable. To our own ear—working only it is true, with a piano—the effect often seems to be simply that of a more or less pleasant hymn-tune gone subtly wrong. But the enthusiasm for experiments, shown by the account of these productions and by the publication of the music in so handsome a book, is a rebuke to some of our older Universities. Mrs. Newhall's music for Euripides is

simple, and is meant to be accompanied only by a flute. It is a pity that she has adopted J. H. Schmidt's metrical systems, and that no English words are

printed. Also, the flute is not so satisfactory for the accompaniment of the human voice as the clarinet—and after all the aulos was a reed instrument.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

GREEK ACCENTS.

A Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek. By J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D., F.B.A. Pp. x+96. London, at the University Press of Liverpool (Hodder and Stoughton), 1924. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR POSTGATE'S book contains an account of our knowledge of the character of the Greek accent (Chapters I. and III. and an Appendix), a summary of the rules of Greek accentuation (Chapter II.), and a plea for a reform in the practice and teaching of Greek accentuation (Chapter IV.).

He is surely right in urging that Greek be pronounced with a stress accent on the marked syllables. The use of a pitch accent would be extremely difficult, even if we knew precisely how the Greek accent sounded, and that is very far from being the case. Consequently, the only practical way to give a meaning to the written accents is to stress them. There is no need to falsify the quantities in so doing. English habits of speech do, of course, tend to make *ἄνθρωπος* and *δούλειος* either $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}$ or $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}$; but a very little practice will enable one to dwell upon the unaccented long vowels and upon all consonant groups.

If these two reforms are carried out the rhythmic structure of the language will be preserved, and the complicated rules for the position of the accent need not be learned. It is well enough to have these clearly stated, as they are in Professor Postgate's second chapter; but I pity one who must take this difficult way to a mastery of Greek writing just because he accents Greek words according to the Latin rule.

It is unfortunate that Professor Postgate perpetuates Sievers' doctrine that syllables are made long by ending in a consonant. Are we then to read (*Il.* I. 9),

Ἀητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός· ὃ γὰρ βασιλῆϊ χολωθεῖς,

with a sense pause between *υἱός* and *ς* *ό*; or (*Il.* VI. 137),

δειδιότα· κρατερὸς γὰρ ἔχε τῆμος ἀνδρὸς ὁμοκλή,

with a sense pause between *δειδιότα* *κ* and *κρατερὸς*? I had hoped that my paper in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* for 1922 would persuade scholars to adopt a more sensible view of syllabification in Greek and Latin.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

CUNTZ'S PTOLEMY.

Die Geographie des Ptolemaeus: Galliae Germania Raetia Noricum Pannoniae Illyricum Italia. Handschriften, Text und Untersuchung von OTTO CUNTZ. Pp. v+226; with three maps. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923. M. 10.

C. MÜLLER'S edition gives a bare list of thirty-eight MSS.—previously discussed elsewhere—and his readings are eclectic. To establish order Professor Cuntz provides a section of Ptolemy with a very full apparatus from seven MSS. chosen as exhaustive and including one (Urbinas) not used by Müller. They fall into two classes, X and RW, diverg-

ing by selection of variants from an uncial archetype going back to Ptolemy's copy, which already had variants in names and reckonings (see his own statement, II. 1. 3). Three MSS. of the inferior class have maps by the same hand as the text: no special Ptolemaic tradition can be claimed for the twenty-seven set of Ur and R, still less for the sixty-eight set of Ω. Agathodaemon appears late in the tradition, and may be put late (end of antiquity or Byz.).

For Illyricum and Germany proper, which lies outside Roman itineraries, the notes, mostly textual, claim only to

supplement Müller. Not here must the curious look for what Ptolemy does with the Scandian islands. But on pp. 67-68 one might expect more emphasis on his strange displacement of several πόλεις really on the Roman side of the Rhine.

The other countries are elaborately treated to discover Ptolemy's methods of work. Only a few latitudes were astronomically fixed—and he could treat some even of these cavalierly (p. 100). He made much use of ill-oriented itineraries from centres fixed fairly correctly, as Rome, Aquileia,

Lyons, or badly, as Boulogne and even Milan; and his reluctance here at least (p. 119) to reduce distances contributes to his amazing distortions of familiar countries, not least of Italy. Ptolemy himself is responsible: his debt to Marinus has been exaggerated (p. 124).

Professor Cuntz tabulates his results on three large charts, explained by an alphabetical commentary, and stresses their bearings on the extant Itinerary material (pp. 127f.). The book will be a valuable instrument for Ptolemy's text and methods.

J. O. THOMSON.

THEORIES OF THE LAUGHABLE.

The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable: The Greek Rhetoricians and Cicero (University of Wisconsin Studies, No. 21). By MARY A. GRANT, Assistant Professor in Classics, University of Kansas. Pp. 168. Madison, 1924. \$2.00.

MISS GRANT has added a creditable piece of work to the Wisconsin series. Its scope is hardly what a reading public familiar with Bergson and others might expect, for the author eschews philosophical discussion and psychological analysis of laughter on elaborate modern lines, and aims simply at collecting and restating the half-scientific ideas of the Greeks and Cicero on *The Laughable*, ideas which arose chiefly in connexion with their incursions into the field of Rhetoric. Starting from uncritical observations on the correct use of laughter, the pre-Socratics paved the way for the more discriminating treatment of the laughable, which culminated with Aristotle and was expanded by the later rhetoricians, who drew upon his results and passed them on to Cicero. The treatise before us sets down in orderly fashion whatever has been preserved of this ancient body of thought about the nature of the emotion of laughter, the means of exciting that emotion, and, above all, the proper and the improper use of it, especially in oratory. For the most part this theory revolves round the ethics of laughter, and much of it sets forth 'the relation of laughter to daily

life and conduct' as the Greek rhetoricians and Cicero viewed the matter.

A discussion of the opinions recorded by Greek thinkers regarding the various kinds of the laughable and its appropriate seasons and objects leads to a review of the literature in which these forms of laughter found expression. An application of extremely simple principles to the non-serious types, grouped under Iambic, Old Comedy, the Mime, Satyr Drama, and the writings of the Cynics, brings out some suggestive features of each type with surprising clearness and point; and the same procedure is followed with Ciceronian theory and the Comic Senses to which Cicero applied his guiding conceptions. An analysis, based on Quintilian, of terms like *ridiculum* and *urbanitas* carries a step further the attempts at definition in the field of antique wit and humour, and completes Miss Grant's survey.

The governing distinction between the liberal and the illiberal jest is felt throughout. Latin literature and rhetorical theory continue the Greek tradition, dissecting motives and prescribing rules, with an eye always to the promotion of morality. With Cicero the moral distinctions tend to emerge as differences of taste, fashioned by convention and propriety. Prevailing theory makes strongly against malicious laughter and the illiberal jest, and plenty of evidence is forthcoming to refute the notion that 'the earliest

names and definitions of humour described only its more intellectual and bitter forms.'

Miss Grant's 'study' marks a decided advance on Arndt's dissertation, published twenty years ago. It not merely is three times as bulky, it contains much interesting critical matter, and gives a good idea of the careful work done by American scholars in this department of philology. We should have been glad to encounter some of the funny things that Caesar found in Greek books 'On Laughter'; but these

books have perished, and we possess little more than the somewhat dry generalities of ancient students of rhetoric and philosophers. Yet even these, as this treatise proves, yield many illuminating ideas on the ever-intriguing problem of the laughable.

A few slips have crept in. *urbanus*, p. 136, should be *urbanus*; *εὐχαριστία*, p. 153, and Tyrell, p. 161; *to* has fallen out before *Lucilius*, p. 134; and the cacophonous *unmotivated* for *unmotivated* seems gratuitous.

T. CALLANDER.

AN EDITION OF THE AULULARIA.

Plautus: Aulularia. Herausgegeben und mit erklärenden Anmerkungen versehen von Dr. K. KUNST. Wien, 1923.

THIS first Heft of a new series of select Latin and Greek texts for Austrian *Mittelschulen* leaves much to desire, not only in the printing (Greek words inaccurate). The notes will hardly help teacher or pupil. Metrically there is no key to Old Latin prosody: syllables that are shortened by Iambic Law might at least be marked in the text,

and the reader be informed that *ind'* and *nemp'* and *mēquidem*, etc., were the Plautine scansiones. A schoolboy should be told that *it=id*; how *iussero* differs from *iubebo*; that *si redierit* means 'as soon as he returns,' not 'if'; what *obstinare* means, etc. Dr. Kunst's exegesis of a characteristic Plautine coarse jest in v. 304 must be read to be believed. Altogether the book is inferior to editions of similar scope in English, French or Italian.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

TERENCE IN ANTIQUITY.

Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum. By GÜNTHER JACHMANN. Pp. 152; 12 illustrations. Rektoratsprogramm der Universität. Basel: F. Reinhardt. 8 Swiss fr.

THE author aims at integrating the many detail-studies in the problem. His method is close, his mind reasonable and refreshingly free from mechanical superstition. The following is an abstract of his inquiry. (1) Are the Terence illustrations ancient? And of what date? Engelhardt and Birt had brought them down to *sæc.* V. or VI. *p.C.* Leo and Robert threw them back to the epoch of Atticus. J. shows that L. and R. were mistaken. The illustrations are not directly drawn from the stage, but literary: 'One scene one picture,' but a *book-scene*, not a *producer's group*. The illustrations depend directly upon the scene-titles. These

points he proves by an ingenious use of small indications reinforced by a probability of common sense, thus: suppose an artist commissioned (by a rich amateur) to illustrate Terence—was it likely he *could* see all the plays acted? If at all possible, it would take him years to get a chance of *Hecyra*. The illustrations are not single marginal figures afterwards combined into groups. Our 'Scenes' were unknown to the stage: the 'Book-scene' goes by entries and exits of persons. The illustrator often omits to represent a most dramatically striking moment because he had before him only the book-division and scene-titles: *e.g.*, in *Ad.* 855-881 he does not depict Demea's vital, central soliloquy but a duo. Why? Because he used a text in which the soliloquy and the very short following dialogue were combined under a scene-title

DEMEA SYRUS. So the original artist need not be dated to an age when Terence still was acted.

(2) What then is the date of the scene-division? Spengel and Leo said 'very old': can we get a precision? It goes back to one editor, whose motives were entirely literary, not dramatic; his original plan has suffered by omission; scenes were telescoped and titles accommodated to the telescoping. Every indication preserved, whether in a text or a commentator, is justified. The established scene-division goes back to the established text edition, which was made by Valerius Probus of Beyrout: he did for Terence what Aristophanes of Byzantium did for old Attic drama; using perhaps also critical marks, which have disappeared. This edition prevailed so that hardly a trace of tradition outside it survives. *Ergo* the illustrations are at earliest Flavian in date. (3) Leo saw that illustration marks a certain class of MSS. which represent a recension: J., accepting this, proceeds to ask, 'Was the original of the γ MSS. illustrated?'; and arguing from *Haut.* 400 infers a particular Personenverteilung from an illustration and concludes that the illustrations were originally executed for the text which begot the γ MSS. (Γ). These preserve a worse text but a more correct scene-division than A or δ . Why? Because the telescoping of scenes and consequent disappearance of

scene-titles was arrested in Γ by the existence of the illustrations. This is confirmed by the remarkable unanimity of the γ MSS. in scene-division. (4) The illustration being after Probus and before cod. Bembinus, by further precisings J. makes out that Γ dates in the later part of *saec.* III. 'Calliopius' was of no critical importance, only a sort of proof-reader, such as men like the Symmachi or Nicomachus might employ.

(5) There was an original Terence-Vulgate which was not wholly, though mainly, superseded by the critical edition of Probus. From a certain third-century edition (ϕ) descend A and its twin-nephews γ and δ .

Jachmann's argument seems to me to hold good at all points, except that, when he says we cannot rise higher than ϕ , he neglects the possibility of individual collation either with a pre- ϕ representative of Probus' recension, or with a representative of the pre-Probus Vulgate. In the age of scholar antiquaries, represented by A. Gellius, I should think it strange if such collation did not take place. And can we regard Probus, remarkable scholar as he was (Sueton. *de Gramm.* 24), as infallible? However, future editors of Terence must add to their task the duty of studying Jachmann; they will bless him for some valuable and (I think) final simplifications.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

LUCRETIIUS IN GERMAN AND IN ENGLISH.

Lukrez von der Natur, übersetzt von HERMANN DIELS. Berlin: Weidmann, 1924. 9 M.

Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, with an English translation by W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1924. 10s. net.

THIS volume of Diels' Lucretius, edited like the first by Mewaldt, contains a translation of the *De Rerum Natura* into German hexameters. How far Diels has been successful can be determined only by his own countrymen; but a foreign reader may give his impression, that these verses, while keeping

close to the text of Lucretius, retain much of the poet's dignity and sincerity. Two extracts in different styles are here quoted:

Nicht das Göttergefabel, nicht Blitz und Donner
des Himmels
Schreckt' ihn mit ihrem Drohn. Nein, um so
stärker nur hob sich
Höher und höher sein Mut. So wagt' er zuerst
die verschlossnen
Pforten der Mutter Natur im gewaltigen Sturm
zu erbrechen.
Also geschah 's. Sein mutiger Geist blieb
Sieger, und kühnlich
Setzt' er den Fuss weit über des Weltalls flam-
mende Mauern
Und er durchdrang das unendliche All mit
forschendem Schritte. (i. 68-74.)

Lasst uns jetzt auch betrachten, was sich
 Anaxagoras dachte
 Unter Homoioimerie. Dies griechische Wort
 ist uns leider
 Wiederzugeben versagt in unserer ärmlichen
 Sprache,
 Aber die Sache vermag ich mit Worten dir
 leicht zu umschreiben.

(i. 830-833.)

The printing and rubrication of the volume are most attractive.

To translate Lucretius into English prose after Munro is an ungrateful task. Munro himself probably regarded his translation as an unimportant part of his work; but it is quite possible to maintain that it is superior even to his text and commentary. It fits the original like a glove, reproducing with equal certainty its finest poetry and plainest prose; and it is an admirable example of English style. In order to justify the existence of their work, subsequent translators are prone to vary Munro's phrasing without improving it. Where he writes 'famous for obscurity,' this latest version has 'illustrious for his dark speech'; and his 'things which they perceive to be concealed under involved language' now becomes 'which they see hidden amid distorted words.' (What are 'distorted' words? Perhaps, considering the style of Heraclitus, 'allegorical' would be nearer the mark than either 'distorted' or 'involved.') Where Munro has already got the best words, they ought to be retained.

The text here printed keeps rather

closer to the MSS. than Munro did; of the new readings, which are not many, most appear to be due to Dr. Postgate; the obelus is seldom, if ever, used; and not many transpositions are accepted. It presents the poem in a convenient and intelligible form. The translation reads like a modernised version of Munro: there are more commas and fewer archaisms; and, though not as close as Munro's, it is generally correct. Some slips and errors have been noticed. In a note to v. 1081 it said that Mr. Duff suggested *progeniem parvom*: if he did, he ought to have known better. In i. 418 *omnis natura* is translated, as it was by Munro, 'all nature': it is a long time since Bernays proved that *omnis* here is the genitive of *omne* = τὸ πᾶν. Lucretius wrote of his *minimae partes* (i. 626):

*quae quoniam sunt,
 illa quoque esse tibi solida atque aeterna faten-
 dum,*

which is here translated: 'And since they exist, you must also confess that they are solid and everlasting.' Munro's version is of course right: 'And since these exist, those first bodies also you must admit to be solid and everlasting': i.e. the existence of the *minimae partes* proves certain qualities of the atom. The translator's taste is not always to be trusted: what would Munro have said if he had seen *philema* (iv. 1169) translated by 'Kissie'? Not even *philemation* would justify such a rendering.

J. D. DUFF.

HERAEUS' MARTIAL.

M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri.
 Recognovit W. HERAEUS. Pp. lxxviii
 + 417. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G.
 Teubneri, 1925. Paper, 6 G.-M.;
 cloth, 8 G.-M.

STUDENTS of Martial now live in an age which was begun by Professor Lindsay's edition of 1903, one of those works which are such boons to mankind that their shortcomings must be forgiven them. All that energy could do in the investigation or skill and industry in the collation of MSS was done, and the fruits of this labour were condensed in an apparatus criticus of the most admirable lucidity. It is true

that one was obliged to form one's text for oneself, but without Mr Lindsay that would not have been possible. Mr Duff produced a more critical recension in 1905, and here is another¹ from Professor Heraeus, who is probably better qualified for editing Martial than anyone else in the world. He has used no new MSS, only correcting faults and omissions in Mr Lindsay's apparatus; but he adds the *testimonia*, which Mr Lindsay generally ignored, and the more important imitations, and prefixes 50 pages of critical notes.

¹ Mr Giarratano's edition is negligible.

Mr Heraeus makes choice among the lections of the MSS with a judgment which I am bound to regard as good because it so often coincides with my own. All the following changes of Mr Lindsay's text (I omit such as are merely orthographical), I 51 4 *uelint*, 76 3 *que chorosque*, II 55 2 *coleris*, III 24 2 *focis*, 68 12 *leges*, 100 4 *iste*, IV 49 2 *ista*, V 16 13 *inuat*, 58 6 *possit*, VI 29 8 *ames*, 45 4 *turpius*, 51 4 *inquis*, 71 4 *sollicitare*, 88 3 *constet*, VII 56 1 *pia*, VIII 4 1 *conuentus*, 6 1 *Eucti*, 56¹ 23 *ero*, IX 67 2 *nemo*, 73 3 *regna*, 92 1 *sint*, 94 1 *Santonica*, XI 70 6 *inspiciunt*, 79 3 *uia*, 99 5 *gemina*, XII 3 12 *Hyan-teae*, 17 3 *pariterque*, 55 13 *non*, 82 5 and 12 *colliget*, XIV 121 2 *uocer*, 197 2 *paene*, are changes which I had made myself. Others too seem right or probable, as III 93 23 *exigis*, IV 59 2 *gutta*, VI 21 3 *aurem*, IX 54 7 *fringuillarum*, X 10 8 *ire*, 48 24 *facient*, XI 7 10 *paras*, 42 2 *quid*, 98 22 *dabit et*, XIV 81 2 *tetrico*; but some are certainly wrong. III 42 4 'quod tegitur, *maius* ($\beta\gamma$, *magnum a*) creditur esse *malum* ($a\beta$, *nefas* γ): if this is compared with 72 2 'nescioquod *magnum* ($a\beta$, *maius* γ) suspicor esse *nefas*', it will appear that single families have corrupted each verse from the other. Mr Heraeus rightly rejects the singular *nefas* and *maius*, yet prefers the singular *magnum* in 42 4: but if Martial wrote *magnum* in both verses, why did *maius* intrude into either? IV 67 8 'quod non *uis* (β , *das* γ Heraeus) *equiti*, *uis dare*, praetor, equo': *das* was introduced by some one who did not see the construction of *equiti*. XIV 130 2 *nusquam a* Lindsay, *numquam* β Heraeus (see too IX 27 7 *usquam* β Duff, *umquam* γ uulgo). Editors should make it a rule, where MSS offer them this choice and sense allows it, to take (*n*)*usquam*, because scribes change it into the commoner word: see for instance Virgil's MSS at *georg.* IV 185, *Aen.* II 142, 620, V 633, IX 420. Other lections

which Mr Heraeus prefers while I side with Mr Lindsay are IV 35 5 *animae*, VII 17 9 *dedicata*, X 12 9 *cognoscendus*, 77 3 *fuisse*.

Mr Heraeus discards in favour of MS readings the following conjectures admitted by Mr Lindsay, who, like conservative editors in general, has a kindness for bad conjectures: *spect.* 21b 2 *mersa*, I 69 1 *qui*, III 82 26 *usus*, VI 14 4 *conscribat*, IX 22 15 *ac*, XI 90 4 *situs*, 99 6 *Minyas*, XII 82 11 *tropin*, 95 1 *Musaei*, XIV 46 1 *mobilibus*, 106 1 *panda*. So far I am with him, but not in refusing VII 96 4 *male*, still less in the two following cases. IV 58 2: to adopt *iam* from *a* is short-sighted and not even really conservative, for it does not account for the *non* of $\beta\gamma$, while *nam* accounts for both: compare the MS variants in III 22 4, 47 6, VI 23 4, VIII 36 4, 52 4, 70 1, IX 54 10, X 37 18. The point of the epigram will perhaps be understood if I say that *uirum* means *marem*. XI 90 3 'et tibi Maeonio *res carmine maior* habetur | LVCILI' etc. β , *quod . . . maius* γ , *quoque . . . maius* Lachmann. 'Wenn eine Stelle in der Ueberlieferung so einwandsfrei ist wie unser *Maeonio res carmine maior*, ist es unzulässig, sie durch eine andere Lesart ersetzen zu wollen, die erst durch Konjektur Sinn erhält' quoth Mr Friedrich. Critics know that the contrary is true, and that in such a case the intelligible reading lies under suspicion, unless it can be shown how the unintelligible reading arose from it. This Mr Heraeus tries to do: he supposes that *maior* was accidentally corrupted to *maius* (a change which he illustrates), and that *res* was then altered by an interpolator to *quod*. But what interpolator would behave so strangely, instead of simply altering *maius* back again into *maior*?

Emendations rejected by Mr Lindsay and accepted by Mr Heraeus are these: II 14 7 *hic*, VII 34 8 *quid tu tot*, IX 54 10 *miluus astra*, X 48 20 *trima*, XI 56 11 *modo qui dum*, XII 3 4 *amnes quos*, 8 *tecta*, 88 1 *nego*, XIII 116 2 *sistant*, XIV 24 1 *madidi*, 158 1 *nata*. Two more, *sp.* 28 10 *Caesar io* and 11 *diri*, are hardly emendations; much less what has been done at XII 59 9. There the MSS mention, among persons by whom it is disagreeable to be kissed, those who are

¹ I quote everywhere according to Schneide-win, Friedlaender, Gilbert, and Duff, and ignore the nuisance of changed and duplicated numeration which Mr Lindsay introduced and Mr Heraeus aggravates. On p. 8 he is caught in his own snare, and has unwittingly transferred to the poem he calls XXVIII (XXVII) a distich of the poem he calls XXX (XXVIII).

lame of the right leg. Does it not seem incredible that this should be defended? yet Mr Heraeus defends it thus: 'δεξιόχωλος mihi est *rechsisseitig gelähmt*, cuius nimirum indecens amplexus est.' Scilicet, qui *linksseitig gelähmt* est, eius amplexus minus est indecens. And this ridiculous reading is also unmetrical; but Mr Heraeus, instead of finding in that any cause for suspicion, rebuilds the verse as a shelter for the cripple by prefixing a worse than superabundant *et*.

He places eight of his own conjectures in the text. The best of these is the excellent emendation X 13 1 'cum *cathedrata litos* portet tibi raeda ministros' for *cathedratalios* or *cotathedratos*: he cites *καρπίον καθεδρωτόν* from a glossary, and for *litos* Mart. X 68 3 and Sen. *ep.* 123 7. At *sp.* 27 9 his 'si *uetus* (for *situs*) *aequorei reuocetur fabula monstri*' is probable, and better than Heinsius' *sit ut. Catacisse* IX 93 3 is just a trifle nearer the MSS than *Calocisse*; but Lobeck, to whom he refers, did not and could not object to the latter formation in a proper name. He admits his own conjectures on easier terms than anyone else's, reading *caede deos* at VI 21 10 and *Cadilla* at VII 87 7 while confessing that the *parce tuo* of Heinsius and the *Gadilla* of β may be right and that the prosody of *Cadilla* is unknown. At *sp.* 15 8 he prints something which I need not mention, for it makes Martial say 'ferret (Meleagros)' in an epigram which begins 'summa tuae, Meleagre'. At 19 3 he writes *cornuta mole* for *cornuto adore*; but who will prefer '*mole petitus*'¹ to *cornu* (*potiore* or *maiore*)? At 27 2 he has plucked up courage to eject Buecheler's obviously and necessarily false conjecture *Parthaoniam*, tamely accepted by five editors in succession just because it was Buecheler's; and perhaps in his next edition of the *Priapea* he will eject *morsit*, which has been repeated with equal servility, from 65 1. But his own supplement '<monstra quibus fudit> barbara terra fera' is also false: *barbara* even so has no legitimate sense, and the

only pentameter in Martial ending with an epithet of the metrical form *ferð* is XII 94 6, where *noua* carries emphasis.² Two conjectures proposed only in the notes, *sp.* 21b 1 *Orphei* and XI 52 9 *leni*, have more to be said for them. The punctuation is amended at VII 38 1, and everyone ought to be ashamed that it was not done before. The *propin* of the MSS in XII 82 11 was vindicated ten years ago by Mr Heraeus in *Rh. Mus.* LXX 1 ff., and he now successfully defends the reading of *aβ* in XIV 29 2 as *Mandatus*, the name of an official like *Leitus* V 8 12 and *Oceanus* III 95 10: Heinsius had already scented a proper name, but did not know that *Mandatus* was such. The explanations of I 15 7 *catenati* and V 44 6 *conclauibus* are true but not new; the interpretation of II 66 8 is pointless.

Perhaps the best novelty in the book, strange to say, comes from Mr Gustav Friedrich, who at III 32 1 f. thus punctuates the text of $\beta\gamma$: '*non (an a) possum uetulam. quereris (quaeris a), Matrinia?* possum | et uetulam, sed tu mortua, non uetula es'. Editors had obtained grammar and sense by writing 'an *possim uetulam quaeris*'; Mr Lindsay composed from *non* and *quaeris* a text untainted by conjecture and punctuated it so as to make Matrinia ask 'non ego femina possum uetulam?'

Mr Heraeus' morality, if I may say so, is good. He is no friend to *liuidas obliuiones*, and duly records what his predecessors have done in the important matter of punctuation. He also respects property, and would rather be right than wrong in naming the author of an emendation; but at *sp.* 23 1 and XI 43 3 he attributes to himself corrections which were quietly made by Mr Duff twenty years before. At VII 72 6 he says '*seu quid Gilbert*': in my margin I have 'Markland', but I cannot supply the reference. Some things I miss: to pass over in silence Munro's perfect completion of II 73 and Mr Duff's necessary correction of IX 3 14, while mentioning three or four of the light-hearted guesses of Mr Lindsay, is not fair to the reader.

¹ *petitus*, however, does not suit the context, *cornuto* . . . *ore* is too good to be an accident, and Martial probably wrote '*cornuto optritus ab ore*'.

² Possessive pronouns are allowed, and the numeral *duo*; *proba* I 4 8 is predicate.

There are valuable notes on II 27 3 *cito*, V 37 8 *nitelam*, VI 70 6 *Alconti*, 94 1 *Calpetiano*, VII 26 4 *haec* fem. plur., IX 22 15 *ac*. But the learned illustration of *uissit* at XII 32 17 is futile, because no such noun as *aura* can be the subject of this verb: *uissitur aura*, non *uissit*. It is quite right to exclude *haud* from IX 2 8, but what is the use of saying 'sciendum est *haud* proprium heroici uersus esse' and 'in elegiacis semper uitatum est' when there are six examples in Propertius and more than forty in Seneca's tragedies? It is also right to reject *cubiculo* at X 30 17, but not right to add 'quali syncopa M. abstinet', for he has *tomacla* in I 41 9.

I subjoin some miscellaneous criticisms.

I 48 6 'nec *caueae* tanta conditur ille fide' is rightly read but mistaken for locative: it is genitive, as I explained at Manil. III 305: see Appul. *met.* IX 18 'fide tenebrarum contextus atque absconditus', Liu. I 26 11 'tanta foeditate supplicii' (tam foedo supplicio).

II 2 5 'editores ubique *Thule*': quite untrue.

II 36 3 *mitratarum* in the note should be *mitratorum*.

III 13 2 'plus quam *patri*, Naeuia, parcis apro': Mr Heraeus hankers after Heinsius' *putri*, which is foreign to the sense, but timidly suggests that *patri* may mean 'seni', which is equally so. The construction, explained by Raderus, is 'plus apro parcis quam patri', you show the boar more than filial consideration.

III 15 1 'quam tota . . . quod . . . lex Marxii . . . falsum coarguit'. Marxii forsooth! see Cortius on Luc. IV 476, where this verse is cited.

III 80 1 'de nullo loqui' and VII 18 1 f. 'de facie dicere' in the sense of 'male loqui (dicere)' are illustrated by Prop. IV 7 42 'de facie siqua locuta mea est': but there the sense is the opposite.

IV 31 10 'morem dicendi et faciendi obscene' is both a strange and a false description of a perfectly definite *σχῆμα* which could be practised by the deaf and dumb.

IV 61 12 text and note conflict, and again XIV 189 2.

V 16 5 the reference to C.L.E. 253 1

is irrelevant, for Hammon is one with Iuppiter and Saturn is not.

V 22 7 *uincere* is probably an attempt to emend *mulorumpere*.

VI 64 3 'hirsuta peperit *deprensa* (a, *rubicunda* βγ) sub ilice coniunx'. Mr Heraeus prefers *rubicunda* and says 'deprensa a, fortasse pudice, ut solet', as if 'sunburnt' were an indecent word or 'overtaken with travail' were more delicate. *depren-sa* may have been swallowed up between *peperit* and *su-*. I take occasion to say that what is termed modesty in a by Mr Heraeus and elegance by Mr Lindsay (who thinks *monstrum* a 'suitable euphemism' to signify what Burke calls the fount of life itself) is mere monkish horror of woman: a will copy down the grossest and filthiest words, such lines as III 71 1 and VII 10 1, if only they do not call up thoughts of the abhorred sex.

VIII 6 7 *chrocos* β is much better explained by Mr Lindsay as from *Rhoecos*: this was the Centaur's true name, which is to be learnt, not from Latin MSS, where c and t are much confused, but from Greek, where κ and τ are not.

VIII 45 4 'facta minor = decollata Buech.' If that were so, *centeno consule* would have to mean 'centesimo', a solecism on which I discoursed at Manil. IV 451: it means 'centum consulibus', and therefore *amphora* means the contents of the jar (Fest. p. 153 metonymia), as indeed *splendescat turbida lino* should be enough to show, and *facta minor* means 'shrunken' (Plin. n.h. XIV 55).

IX 44 3 'solet hoc, sc. ridet Hercules poculum tenens.' If so, if the statuette had a fixed smile on its face (which, by the way, *solet* is incapable of meaning), it could not smile in answer to Martial's question, non risit uerum ridebat; it must therefore have been Vindex who smiled and was wont to smile, and *Alcides . . . Vindicem* must be read. What a world is this, in which such truths have to be enunciated! Mr Heraeus, I may add, makes *poeta* vocative, though Mr Lindsay removed that error.

X 80 6 the note is confused: it is Scriuerius who puts a comma after *ridet*.

XI 99 Mr Heraeus rightly reads *gemina* in 5 and refuses both *Minyas* and *minias* in 6, but adds 'tamquam parum sit lusus ex Argonautis aut ex colore podicis μελαμπύγου (*cyaneas*, non *Cy.*)'. Ergo femina μελάμπυγος? et quid id ad rem?

XI 100 4 'uariavit modum metro cogente': immo sensu. I warned scholars against that error in my note on Iuu. VII 185. The subjunctives *cingant radat pungat* are conditional, 'cingant anuli lacertos si induantur, clune radat amica enuque pungat si amplecti uelis'; 'serra lumbis eminet' is absolute. So Luc. VI 436 f. 'ficti quas nulla licentia monstri | transierit (si fingatur), quarum quidquid non creditur ars est', X 456 f. 'hic, cui Romani spatium non sufficit orbis | paruaque regna putet (si dentur, quod non fit) Tyriis cum Gadibus Indos'.

XIII 74 1 (on the false form *Tarpeia*) 'Prop. IV 10 31 *Veius dux astitit pro dux Veius ast. legerim*'. That would be

a pity. The gentile name *Veius* is of course disyllabic (Hor. *epod.* 5 29), but the poetical adjective formed from *Vei* on the analogy of *Troius*, which occurs again G.L.K. VI p. 563 6 ('corruptum uidetur' says Mr Heraeus), is and ought to be a dactyl.

XIV 131 1 '*qui c. sumis* γ prob. Markland, at cf. ad XI 42 2', where it is observed that Martial has not the adverb *qui*: but here *qui* will be the relative pronoun.

XIV 216 2 *decipit* would be better defended by the single citation *paraphr.* Dionys. ὀρνθ. III 5 than by Mr Heraeus' vague reference to Hehn and by his totally inapposite references to the *thes. ling. Lat.* and *Columella*. He cannot really think that 'accipitres decipiuntur' supports 'accipiter decipit', nor that hawks catch birds with birdlime.

I have found some errors in numerals, and on p. vii there are four.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE TEXT OF PLINY'S 'LETTERS.'

(1) *A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's 'Letters.'* By EDWARD KENNARD RAND. Printed from the Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXXIV., 1923.

(2) *Id. ib.*, from Vol. XXXV., 1924.

In these papers Mr. Rand carries out part of the scheme which he outlined in the recent volume on the Pierpont Morgan fragment of Pliny's *Letters*, but they are also a vigorous rejoinder to a no less vigorous onslaught made by Mr. E. T. Merrill. Mr. Rand, it will be remembered, suggested that the Morgan fragment (II) might be a portion of the very *Parisinus* (P) which Aldus used for his famous edition of 1508. Taking this as a hypothesis he applied various tests, and found what seemed to be strong cumulative evidence in favour of his supposition. Mr. Merrill (in *Classical Philology*, Vol. XVIII.) declares that Mr. Rand's arguments have the cumulative force of 'a string of zeros.' At the end of his paper, however, he springs a surprise on the reader, admitting that he is really 'somewhat inclined to the suspicion that II may be a part of *Parisinus*.' His attack, it now

appears, was directed rather against Mr. Rand's arguments than against his thesis or hypothesis.

But that is not all, or nearly all. II may be a part of P, but it is a very small fragment. Everyone would like to obtain definite indications of the readings of *Parisinus* from beginning to end of the *Letters*. What offers the nearest approach to this happy consummation—especially in the latter half of the collection, where B and F are not available?¹ 'The Budaëus volume in the Bodleian,' Mr. Merrill would say; 'Aldus is hopeless.'² 'Quite the contrary,' says Mr. Rand. That is the main issue in a nutshell.

Mr. Rand's former convictions have not only been strengthened, they have put forth fresh branches wondrous to behold. Even if one were only mildly

¹ I feel bound to mention these codices. They are necessarily kept in the background at the present stage of the investigation, but they may assume some importance later on.

² See Mr. Merrill's Teubner ed., Praef., p. xiii.; *Class. Phil.* XIV. (1919), pp. 29 ff.; also, on the Bodleian volume, *Class. Phil.* II. (1907), pp. 129 ff.

interested in the Plinian text-tradition one would surely be startled out of indifference by the intriguing contention that the transcript (I) made for Budaeus¹ and inserted in the now famous Bodleian volume is taken, not from P, or from a copy of P, but from a conflated text with very distinct traces of the M-tradition. This is heresy indeed! And in the second dissertation, which examines the text for part of Book X., the testimony of i (the variants attributed wholly or mostly to Budaeus himself) is shown to be confused and unsatisfactory. On the other hand, Aldus comes out well, and the writer ends, as he began, with the pronouncement that as far as his investigations have proceeded 'the Aldine edition, not the Bodleian volume, is our most trustworthy witness to the text of the ancient *Codex Parisinus*.'

Mr. Rand's first paper, which is of considerable length, must have been written in a very short time, yet it abounds in noteworthy observations, and it contains some very learned and fascinating information on early scholars, printers, and palaeographers (incidentally he finds time to demolish the legend that Aldus claimed to have modelled his type on the script of Petrarch). It would be surprising if the work did not show some signs of haste. The writer's views seem to have expanded as he proceeded; one gets the impression, rightly or wrongly, that the rather startling conclusions reached in some of the final sections had not been fully present in his mind when he composed the earlier parts. There are some inadvertences, and occasionally in both dissertations one

comes across a sentence which reads like *petitio principii*. Some parts are certainly more convincing than others. But a doubt here and a query there do not affect one's admiration for the work as a whole. He has faced difficulties fairly and squarely. Obviously the last word has not been said on the Bodleian volume. Mr. Rand's examination of this reputed witness for P is certainly disquieting, and he has surely shown beyond all doubt that the charmingly simple method which consists in convicting Aldus of conjectural meddling wherever he differs from the Bodleian version will never, never do.

Mr. Rand has pointed out several instances where the Aldine reading compares very favourably with that of Budaeus and others. He also holds that in many cases where the Aldine text is unsatisfactory in itself it is reasonable to suppose that Aldus, feeling little confidence in the rival readings, preferred to print the text as given in his favourite MS., *Parisinus*. This is a great deal to ask one to believe, and at the present stage Mr. Rand does not ask us to believe it, though he has considerable hope that further investigation will substantially confirm his theory. The most obvious difficulty—of which he is, of course, perfectly well aware—is that Aldus, on his own confession, used for his text of Pliny a number of MSS. and printed editions and collations. But there is at all events no reason to doubt that Aldus prized *Parisinus* very highly; he believed that he had got a real treasure, and it is only natural to suppose that he made extensive use of it. What he says about the difficulty of reading it may be simply a shrewd 'puff' to emphasise its antiquity (Aldus, honest man, was also a business man); in any case, he had Giocondo's transcript to help him.

W. B. ANDERSON.

ROMAN EPITAPHS IN VERSE.

Étude sur la poésie funéraire romaine d'après les inscriptions. Par ÉDOUARD GALLETIER. One vol. Royal 8vo. Pp. xiii + 340. Paris: Hachette, 1922. 25 fr.

THIS is an interesting book on an interesting subject. The metrical epitaphs

are studied in three main aspects, religious or philosophical, historical, and literary. These main sections are appropriately subdivided; thus in the second section, for example, we have chapters on 'l'épithaphe et la biographie du défunt,' 'la vie familiale d'après les

¹ Not 'by Budaeus,' as I inadvertently wrote in my review of Messrs. Lowe and Rand's book—though not, I am glad to say, in the actual description of the Bodleian volume.

épitaphes,' and 'les milieux sociaux.' There is some overlapping, but that was scarcely avoidable. The author is exceedingly well-informed; his bibliography is not, as some bibliographies are, 'the evidence of things not seen'; above all, he has studied the *carmina epigraphica* with loving care and with admirable thoroughness. Those who know their Bücheler and their Engström will appreciate both the labour which has gone to the making of the book and the soundness of the treatment. They will probably not find many facts or notions that are new to them (though here and there, especially in the footnotes, the author shows that he is by no means devoid of independent judgment), and they may question a few statements (for example, in the chapter on metre and versification), but they can scarcely fail to acknowledge that for comprehensiveness allied to sympathy and skill of presentation M. Galletier's book must take a very high place among works on the subject. On the other hand, one would like to think that so good a book will be read by many who know little about Latin metrical epitaphs. The number even of professed scholars who come under this category is surprisingly large; to these, as well as to undergraduates and to persons in various walks of life who have 'kept up their Latin,' a new and delightful world will be revealed if they read M. Galletier's pages. Yet they will not be completely satisfied; indeed, they will find the book rather tantalising. They will see the same epitaph mentioned in different connexions in about a dozen different places, with perhaps a snatch of quotation here and there, but they will nowhere find it quoted as a whole; if any pieces are fully quoted they are very short ones indeed.¹ Sometimes, as if to aggravate a vain thirst, the author dwells on the beauty or the importance of the unquoted *carmen*. In this respect the plan adopted by M. Plessis and carried out by pupils under his supervision is much better for the non-specialist scholar. In M. Plessis' *Épigraphes* (Paris, 1905)

¹ The recently discovered epitaph of Allia Potestas is a partial exception, being given as appendix.

there is a short but adequate introduction followed by a liberal selection of epitaphs, each provided with helpful notes. The study of the *Eucharis*-epitaph (Bücheler 55) or of the *Praetextatus*-poems (Bücheler 111) under such guidance is worth many pages of scattered observations. M. Galletier mentions the first of these pieces at least thirteen times, and descants on the charm which it possesses as a whole, but he nowhere gives more than a fragment of the actual words. *Praetextatus* is mentioned almost as frequently, with quotations scarcely less meagre. Thus the reader who knows not Bücheler is hampered and baulked at every turn, and yet it is mainly to such readers (some of whom, indeed, would find Bücheler rather hard reading) that M. Galletier could be of the greatest service. If he had quoted and explained a score or two of selected inscriptions his book would have been far more likely to answer its purpose. Perhaps he will yet do this in a small companion-volume.

In the difficult matter of dating the epitaphs M. Galletier follows Bücheler. Bücheler is, no doubt, a high authority on such subjects, but it is never safe to follow anyone blindly. M. Galletier tells us frequently that the above-mentioned epitaph of *Eucharis* belongs to the time of Sulla. (In one place he says 'the middle of the first century B.C.'). It may, and again it may not; but of that supposed date the book makes liberal use, for the inscription is declared to mark a stage in the treatment, first of woman, then of children, in epitaphs. If the piece be of later date (and there is really a good deal to be said in favour of assigning it to the early Empire), more than one paragraph in the book misses fire.

When an inscription is in the first person singular M. Galletier has a habit of saying 'the deceased tells us,' or words to that effect. Perhaps there is not much harm in that; but occasionally he uses without justification words which imply that the epitaph was composed by the deceased in his or her lifetime. It is difficult to believe that Philocalus the schoolmaster composed his own epitaph (Bücheler 91), though

M. Galletier twice says so pretty plainly.

M. Galletier shows a wide knowledge of Latin literature. The frequent com-

parison of the metrical epitaphs and the literary works of the Romans is a very useful feature of a book which combines learning and charm in no small degree.

W. B. ANDERSON.

OLD CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS IN LATIN.

Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres. Edidit ERNESTUS DIEHL. Fasciculi I.-V. Pp. 1-400. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1924-5. M. 3.75 a fascicule.

THIS work is a worthy sequel to Dessau's invaluable *Inscriptiones latinae selectae*. It is to comprise all Christian inscriptions in Latin noteworthy either for subject-matter or for language, down to the beginning of the seventh century. The texts are arranged in two divisions, one containing those referring to Roman affairs, the other those whose importance lies principally in questions of Christian belief or ecclesiastical organisation. First comes appropriately enough the inscription from Arycanda recording the demand of the Lycians and Pamphylians for the persecution of Christians. As illustrative of the interest of these inscriptions we may note Constantine's description of Christians as *sectatores sanctissimae religionis* (3), which illustrates what Warde Fowler defined as the last stage in the ancient development of the word, which has come to mean a particular form of belief; the application to Phocas of the words *a deo coronato* (30) as an indication of the belief in the divine right of kings;¹ *Alphabetdenkmäler* (34a, 912²), which exemplify the survival of pagan superstitions; a possible indication of a pagan revival in Britain in the fourth century (86a); the use of *panteum* to describe an elaborate mausoleum (98: end of fourth century); the description of wifely virtue *serviuit annus XVI. coniugi caro* (405); the epitaph of a woman doctor (615); and a much discussed condemnation of second marriages (1003: on this cf. W. M. Calder, *Anatolian Studies*, 83 f., 89). Professor Diehl records the decoration of the

sarcophagi, the inscriptions of which he prints, as, for instance, a representation of a winged *genius* driving a car drawn by doves (191), with which we may compare the dove-drawn car in which a *genius* carries off a child in a painting in an underground burial-place beneath the Via Trionfale at Rome,³ or, again, the carving of a snake (279); pagans had regarded this as the form into which the soul passed.

It is by no means easy to determine with certainty whether pre-Constantinian inscriptions are Christian or not; on the vast majority of such Christian gravestones in Asia Minor the religion of the dead is carefully veiled.⁴ The hope of happiness hereafter may be hinted at, but not stated, as in an epitaph found by the Via Salaria and assigned on grounds of lettering to the latter half of the third century: *hoc unum, si quid tamen est post corpora sensus, | pignus habere mei patiar te semper amoris | inuoluta tuum coniunx servabo cubile*. The use of DEP. (= *depositus*) in the same text stamps it as clearly Christian, no certain pagan example having been produced.⁵ Very

³ *Notizie degli scavi*, 1922, 432 ff., fig. 3, Pl. II. (described *Year's Work*, 1922-3, 51). This is, perhaps, a way of showing a form of apotheosis, cf. L. Deubner, *Röm. Mitteil.* XXVII. (1912) 11 f.

⁴ Calder, *Anatolian Studies*, 61.

⁵ *Notizie degli scavi*, 1914, 224 (in v. 1 *me* should be inserted before *miseram*, in 3 *improbe* should be *improba*; either author or stone-cutter may be to blame). For DEP. see Caesar, *Observationes ad aet. tit. christ.* (Diss. Bonn, 1896, 23 f.), *Thes. l. L.* V. 583. 26 ff.: the earliest dated Christian instance (DP) is 290 A.D. (Apul. *Met.* X. 12, *sepulchrum, quo pueri corpus depositum iacebat*, does not tell against the view that epigraphic DEP. is Christian). *si . . . sensus* is a commonplace (cf. Philemon. *Inc.* XL. a *Meineke* = 130 Kock), and *si* is not necessarily sceptical, cf. Catull. 14. 17 *si luxerit*, Hor. *Serm.* II. 3. 33 *si quid Sertinius ueri crepat. oideis adávaros* is not sceptical: it means 'every man must die,' but does not deny the future life.

¹ Later symbolised by the Byzantine coin-type showing God's hand held over the Emperor, as *B.M.C. Byz. Coins*, Pl. LXIV. 2.

² Not 909, as Diehl says *ad* 34.

puzzling is an inscription found by the Via Flaminia at Rome of uncertain date, assigned by De Rossi with no stated reasons to the period shortly after the Edict of Milan: *quod filia mea inter sedes fidelis fuit, inter al[ie]nos bagana* (1342). Curious, again, is a soldier's epitaph for his wife at Ovilova: *crestiana fidelis . . . per partum subito ducente in pio fato est tradita Tartaris imis . . . o quit (=quid) tribuat genesis, qui separat conuigginios dulcis* (1336). Whether the writer of the latter was a professing Christian we cannot say. When Christianity became the official religion, and some measure of conformity was almost universal, older ideas might well be in evidence among its adherents, as magical practices came to be.¹ Thereafter we may expect a certain blending of ideas in inscriptions, as we may earlier also among the small sects not controlled by the discipline of the Catholic Church.² We must, however, be slow to draw conclusions: the man who ordered the stone-cutter to carve an epitaph might be content to have a Christian close added to a gravestone ready for use; again, literary reminiscences can produce a semblance of paganism.³ The whole question of

the relations in which popular Christianity in its various forms stood to official Christianity in the first three centuries of its existence calls for thorough investigation, for which the inscriptions give evidence of great value. They provide us with a mass of commonplace writing by ordinary people, and this may help to correct our mental picture of an age in which we often see too much of the high lights and too little of the background. Most of the epitaphs which fill so much of this work are as unoriginal as the epitaphs usually are; they afford a certain interest of terminology in the use of fixed phrases as *fidelis dei* and *famulus dei* (which has pagan antecedents, cf. *Thesaur. ling. Lat.* VI. 267. 61 ff., 269. 13 ff.).

These notes may serve as some indication of the importance of this publication to all those who are concerned with the life and thought of the Roman Empire, and with the history of the development of the Latin language. Professor Diehl has not contented himself with collecting, selecting, and republishing texts; he has added brief and admirable notes with explanations of historical allusions and citations of parallels. The remaining fascicules of this work, and in particular the promised full indices, will be awaited with eagerness, but even now the editor may be most warmly congratulated on the great service which he has rendered to linguistic, historical, and theological studies.

A. D. NOCK.

importance of the first consideration: for the second cf. 798. 8 *Caereris ut iugo Bacchique posse* (read *posset*) *teneri*, and 787.

¹ Cf. Eitrem-Fridrichsen, *Ein christliches Amulett auf Papyrus* (*Videnskaps-Selskabet's Forhandlinger*, 1921, i. 26 ff.), and a note by the writer, *Folklore*, XXXVI, 1925, 94 ff.

² Adherents of some such sect were perhaps responsible for the paintings in the hypogaeum in the Viale Manzoni at Rome (published in *Notizie*, 1920 and 1921 and *Monumente Antichi*, 1923). It would not be too rash to conjecture that more inscriptions in this collection are due to heretics than the group classed as such (1636-1643).

³ Cavedoni and Kaufmann (*Handbuch der altchristlichen Epigraphik*, 134) emphasise the

Three Inscriptions from Crete. Translated and edited by RICHARD JOHNSON WALKER, M.A. (Oxon). Pp. 96. Monaco: Published by the Author. 10s. 6d.

THIS is a work of the imagination. Up till now it has been the accepted view that the Praisos inscriptions, with which Mr. Walker deals, were in an otherwise unknown language. To Mr. Walker the language of the inscriptions is obviously Greek, and he attempts to make this equally plain to the reader by rewriting them. Thus, the third inscription, a fragment containing rather over a hundred letters without interpuncts, is transmogrified into fourteen

passable hexameters in the Epic dialect. The second is found to be a trade inventory—some of the letters are assumed to represent numerals, others contractions for names (some of them not very well attested) of articles of commerce, and the remainder, with the assistance of some supplied by Mr. Walker, are found to form words in Attic Greek. It is very simple if one has sufficient imagination, and is resolute enough to disregard every canon of criticism and the known facts of the history of the Greek language.

J. FRASER.

Die Entstehung der Säulenbasen des Altertums unter Berücksichtigung verwandter Kapitele. By ERWIN and REINHOLD WURZ. Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Architektur, Beiheft 15. Pp. ii+150. Over 400 illustrations. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1925. Marks 20.

THE range of this book is wider than its title suggests, for capitals occupy nearly as much space as bases. It is the work of two brothers, each of whom published an important treatise on a cognate theme just before the war. Erwin is responsible for more than half this book, but the long sections on Aeolic, Ionic, and Corinthian capitals are by his brother. The ruling idea of both writers is that, except for some Egyptian forms, almost all ancient columns, including those of Greece, Etruria, and Rome, are derived exclusively from a stylisation of the date-palm, which first took place in Minoan Crete, inspired by specimens of this tree with which Cretan monarchs adorned their parks. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that every detail of base, shaft, and capital, of every style and of every period, is here traced back to this single source. The authors know their material thoroughly, and are remarkably accurate, though some of their predecessors deserve more recognition, especially von Luschan; but, despite much ingenious and some convincing argument, it is clear that the theory is worked much too hard. One is reminded of Goodyear's omnipresent lotus. The book, however, is far too elaborate for detailed criticism in this place. The illustrations form a very convenient collection, drawn from a great variety of sources.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

La Spedizione di Serse da Terme a Salamina.

By GIULIO GIANNELLI. Pp. viii+84. With 4 rough plans. Milan: Società editrice 'Vita e Pensiero.' 6 lire.

SIGNOR GIANNELLI has given us in this volume a clear and critical account of Xerxes' invasion of Greece. He has studied with care and intelligence the principal works, whether German or English, bearing on the subject, and by his study has been led to conclusions which, if seldom novel, are generally just and sensible. Thus, his work should be of the greatest use to his own countrymen, though English students would probably benefit more by consulting the more original works from which he draws. For, to tell the truth, he has little of his own to add. Though he draws an interesting parallel between the policy of Sparta in sending Leonidas to Thermopylae, and that of England in the expedition to the Dardanelles, for the most part he is content to expound the theories of his predecessors, and take his choice from among them. In the main, he concentrates his attention on the battles, Thermopylae, Artemisium, and Salamis, but he has not the intimate acquaintance with topography which might give his conclusions real weight and authority. Again, at Salamis he wrongly follows Diodorus in placing the Spartans next the Athenians, and attempts to bring Herodotus into harmony with his view by a mere mistrans-

lation of Herodotus' regular word 'Lacedaemonians.' Nevertheless, his general view of the battle is sound, and the arguments in its favour collected in his final note thorough and convincing.

W. W. HOW.

The Greek Commonwealth: Politics and Economics in Fifth-Century Athens. By A. ZIMMERN. Fourth edition, revised. Pp. 471. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Cloth, 16s. net.

WHAT is new since the third edition in this essential book is almost confined to an appendix of six pages, to which we are led by references in the notes (one has been omitted on p. 419). The chief topics are: Carthaginian mystifications about the Western seas, the fisheries of the Euxine, the debt of Roman law to Greece, coinage in the Athenian Empire, the League of Nations, the rise of imperial funds by Pericles, and Melos.

E. HARRISON.

Madness in Ancient Literature. By AINSWORTH O'BRIEN-MOORE. Pp. 228. Weimar: R. Wagner Sohn, 1924.

THIS is a Princeton Dissertation, much more interesting and instructive than most doctoral theses. The author begins by distinguishing between the popular conception of 'possession' and the medical notion of 'humours.' He illustrates and discusses the treatment of Madness in Comedy, Homer, Tragedy, Virgil, Quintus Smyrnaeus, Nonnus, Seneca. The chapters on Tragedy are, perhaps, the best, but the writer would have contributed more to the interpretation of the plays—particularly, for example, of the *Ajax*—if he had given more attention to the Greek conception of sanity—*Sophrosyne*, self-knowledge. 'There is nothing,' he says, 'to suggest that Ajax was mad previous to this act of Athena's. The expedition against the chiefs was not strictly so considered. He set out on that because he was angry.' In a sense it is true. Athena drove him mad and so saved him from his own design. But in a sense, as Professor Pearson has pointed out, he showed clear signs of madness—because anger is itself a sort of madness, and the Greek tragedians knew it—long before Athena intervened. And his boast, when he set out, was the beginning of madness and ruin. For similar reasons it is unfair to Euripides to suggest that in the *Hercules Furens* 'there is nothing in the first half of the play to indicate that Heracles is destined to go mad.'

J. T. SHEPPARD.

Beiträge zur griechischen Metrik. By Professor JOSEPH KRÁL. Pp. 75. (*Facultas philosophica Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis V.*) Prague: Řivnáč, 1925. 15 Kč.

THIS dissertation has had a remarkable history. The late Professor Joseph Král of Prague University, an eminent scholar who received an honorary degree at St. Andrews in recognition of his services in relation to the Platonic MSS., adopted as his life-work the composition of an elaborate treatise on Greek and Roman rhythmic and metric, written in Bohemian and

published in three substantial volumes between the years 1906 and 1913. The first part (Greek Rhythmic) appeared in a new edition in 1915. On the conclusion of his work Král felt the need of introducing the results of his investigations to a larger audience, and at the time of his death in 1917 had arranged for the publication in the *Wiener Studien* of the series of essays now before us, which contains the chief matters upon which Král believed that he had something new to say either by way of the criticism of current views or of a novel interpretation of the facts. The result of the War was that the further continuation of the periodical became unlikely, and its editors returned Král's MS. to his family. Anxious to secure publication, Král's representatives were at length successful in arranging for the appearance of the treatise as No. V. of the publications of the philosophical faculty of Prague University. The result is fortunate; for everyone who takes an interest in Greek metres should become acquainted with Král's admirably clear and reasonable exposition. He is thoroughly familiar with the literature, both ancient and modern, relating to the subject, he has the supreme merit of acknowledging exactly how far the evidence extends, and he is ready to warn his readers that many of the recent theories rest upon more or less hazardous combinations for which there is no direct proof. But his services are not merely negative; for in cases where current views are admittedly open to question he makes suggestions of his own which deserve at least our careful consideration. Although he attacks some of the results obtained by advocates of the new metric—notably Wilamowitz and Schroeder—he is by no means a reactionary. No attempt is made to resuscitate Anacrusis or the Cyclic Dactyl. Král's method is to take some of the most thorny questions involved in the analyses of Greek lyric metres, to show exactly where current treatment fails to satisfy, and to conclude with a new suggestion which (it is argued) avoids the pitfalls hitherto found fatal. The subjects studied are as follows: (1) The new metric, (2) anacrusis, (3) logaedics (the old name is preserved owing to the absence of a suitable alternative but with full consciousness of its defects), (4) dactylo-epitrites (these are interpreted as ionics), (5) dochmiacs (baccheic in origin). A brief notice such as the present cannot discuss or even describe many of the obscure topics which are here in question. I must content myself with a few words on one of the problems raised by the chapter on logaedics. Král rejects the tetrasyllabic scansion of the Glyconic which the new metric advocates: —u—u, u—u—; and would interpret it as an iambic dimeter with anapaestic variation in the second metron: —u—, uu—u—. No student of Greek metre should neglect this short but valuable work.

A. C. PEARSON.

Ricostruzione Metrica e Ritmica dei Canti Lirici nelle Tragedie Greche. Saggio dall'Edipo Rè di Sofocle. By Professor M. LA PIANA. Pp. 43. Turin: Bona, 1925. L. 8.
The larger part of this brochure is devoted to the construction of metrical schemes analysing NO. CCXCIX. VOL. XXXIX.

the choral odes of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. I am regretfully forced to the conclusion that the schemes are of little value. Professor La Piana writes as though the field had not been surveyed by the labours of earlier scholars; at any rate he makes no acknowledgement to any of his predecessors, and appears to rely entirely on subjective impression. How far he is qualified for his self-imposed task may be judged from his statement that the only metre employed in Sophocles' play is the dactylo-trochaic or iamb-anapaestic, with the single exception of the choriambic ode beginning at 483. The schemes represent an attempt to prove this in detail, and the results, as might be expected, are often extraordinary. Some of the well-known metres, e.g. the glyconic and the dochmiac, disappear entirely. In a comparatively simple 'Aeolic' ode (463 ff.) the opening $\kappa\omega\lambda\alpha$ are scanned as two trimeters (dactylo-trochaic), each of which is preceded by a *trisyllabic anacrusis* (my italics):

u—u || —' —uu —u || —u —u —u
— — — || —' —uu —u || —u —u —u

But the dochmiac fares even worse. 656=685 clearly consists of two dochmii. Yet La Piana insists that the metre is iambic and scans:

^ u u u — u — || ^ — u — u —

But since this analysis will not fit the text, he omits $\epsilon\nu$ in 656 and $\pi\pi\alpha$ in 685, a severe test of our credulity. There is scarcely any scheme which is not open to similar criticism.

A. C. PEARSON.

Pindars Stil. Von FRANZ DORNSEIFF. Pp. vi+135. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1921.

To make Pindar's style comprehensible is very difficult, as any teacher who has made the attempt knows. Professor Dornseiff, in seeking to meet this need, has the advantage of possessing a real appreciation of his author, and he has written an interesting book. What he says of the origin of choral lyric in popular chants and dances (pp. 3 ff.), of the circles for which Pindar wrote (pp. 7 ff.), of the Greek feeling for nature (pp. 47 ff.), deserves attention; and his treatment of the meaning of the first person in choral lyric (pp. 88 ff.) is reasonable. In particular, the combination in this book of observation of detail with perception of weightier matters of poetry is to be praised. For the delay which has happened in the giving of this praise the reviewer must confess himself in part to blame.

A. D. NOCK.

Platon: Oeuvres Complètes. Tome VIII., 3^e partie: *Le Sophiste.* Texte établi et traduit par AUGUSTE DIÈS. Pp. 33+180. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1925. Frs. 14.

M. DIÈS here completes his Volume VIII. of the 'Budé' Plato, of which the *Parmenides* and the *Theaetetus* formed the first two parts. His work maintains the same high level throughout. The Introduction which he has written for the

Sophist shows in an eminent degree the virtues which we have learnt to expect from the best French scholarship: its precision is always graceful; its analysis is thorough and practical, but never arid or oppressive; and it steers a sensible and expeditious course among the alluring or menacing lights of modern commentators. This success is due to its author's intimate understanding of Plato's work, both early and late, and to his constant sense of the main mental impulses which that work reveals. He is thus able to concentrate attention on the *Sophist* without ever losing touch with its immediate predecessors, the *Parmenides* and *Theaetetus*, or even with the *Protagoras*, *Republic*, *Phaedrus*, and other earlier explorations of the master. He has a particularly useful remark (p. 272) on the prominence given in the *Sophist* to the scientific spirit as something yet more important than scientific method.

The translation is both accurate and attractive; the brief notes give useful references to parallel passages in other dialogues, and occasional elucidations of dark places in the thought. In 241a the text ejects τὰ πρὸ τούτων ὁμολογηθέντα as a gloss on the προδηλωσθημένα just before; and in 249d it gives μέντοι ἂν ᾖ for the μέντοι ἂν ᾖ of the manuscripts, which has similarly exercised the editors. Both of these emendations seem to be real improvements.

W. R. M. LAMB.

Zur Geschichte der teleologischen Naturbetrachtung bis auf Aristoteles. By WILLY THEILER. Pp. ix+104. Zürich: Füssli, 1925. Fr. 6 (M. 4.80).

DR. THEILER'S 'Contributions to the History of the Teleological View of Nature' falls into three parts, dealing with pre-Platonic literature, Plato, and Aristotle respectively. The first part is much the longest, comprising three-fifths of the book. In it an attempt is made to show that Diogenes of Apollonia was the chief or only representative among philosophers of the teleological view, and that later teleology was largely developed under his influence. The main thread here is provided by two sections of Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (I. iv. and IV. iii.), which are subjected to minute examination and analysed into their components. The argumentation is ingenious but highly precarious; and, while there is much that is plausible and suggestive, it is difficult to see that the main contention is at all firmly established. The second and third sections suffer from excessive compression: Plato and Aristotle are only allowed twenty pages each; but each of these chapters contains much that is interesting and provocative of thought. The clue to Plato's development is found in the notion of the soul as mover advanced in the *Phaedrus*, which is therefore certainly later than the *Republic*. The consequent recognition of the reality of motion (signified, for instance, by the admission of κίνησις to the μέγιστα γέννη of the *Sophist*) enabled Plato to find rationality in visible nature. The clue to Aristotle's development is found in the growth of a new notion of φύσις, which is traced in outline through the dialogues. Theiler argues against Jaeger that the *Pro-*

trepticus should be dated later than the *πρὸ φιλοσοφίας*) and through the early works to its completed form in the later works. In these two concluding chapters Dr. Theiler has brought together much interesting material, and has shown that the problem deserves a fuller and more philosophical treatment than he has been able to give it in the space at his disposal.

J. L. STOCKS.

Die Pädagogik des Isokrates als Grundlegung des humanistischen Bildungsideals, im Vergleich mit den zeitgenössischen und den modernen Theorien dargestellt. Von AUGUST BURK (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XII. Band, 3/4. Heft). Pp. viii+231. Würzburg: Selbstverlag Univ. Professor Dr. Drerup, Hofpromenade 1, 1923. 6s. net.

THIS lengthy work is a *Preisarbeit* of the University of Würzburg, written by a pupil of Drerup's. The views of Isocrates on pedagogics, as on most other subjects which interested him, appear in his speeches: there is no reason to suppose that he published any methodical treatment of this science. Burk, after dealing with earlier sophists and the relationship in which Isocrates stood to them, discusses the evidence for his educational principles and practice. His subsequent account of the system of teaching of Isocrates is marked by great enthusiasm, and by the strong contention that Isocrates is the father of humanistic education. It may be that his importance in this connexion has been underestimated, as the historical significance of his writings certainly was till recent years; at the same time, it must be remarked that clear pedigrees can seldom be traced in the development of educational ideas. In any case, this is a book which students of Isocrates should not ignore.

A. D. NOCK.

Kring Platons Phaidros. Av GUNNAR RUDBERG. (Svenskt Arkiv för Humanistiska Avhandlingar. I.) Pp. 167. Göteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1924. Stiff paper, 6 Kronor. FOR want of a Platonist who can cope with Swedish I have spent some time over this book, only to decide that the best I can do for it is to refer the curious to Paul Shorey's review in *Classical Philology* for last January (Vol. XX., No. 1), which seems to me to give a discriminating account of this interesting study of the *Phaedrus* in all its bearings.

E. HARRISON.

Vom Kentrites bis Trapezus. Eine Bestimmung des Weges der Zehntausend durch Armenien. Von DR. FR. SEGL. Pp. 60. Erlangen: U. Bittner. N.D. Paper, M. 1.20.

THE problem how to spread fifty-five days of marching over the 350 miles of more or less respectable road which separate the Teleboas-Kara Su (*Anab.* IV. 4, 7) from Trapezus (*ibid.* 8, 22) has called forth many solutions; and the appearance of Dr. Segl's pamphlet reminds us of the merry tourney between le colonel A. Boucher and General-leutnant von Hoffmeister

and adherents, which was going rather badly for the Frenchman when the Great War broke out. It is generally agreed that the retreat over the northern mountains began on the road from the Bohtan Su (Kentrites) to Melasgerd, and reached Trebizond by the road from Persia through Erzeroum; the attempt to determine the exact point at which the former road was left and the other reached, and to fix the sites of Gymnias, Mt. Theches, etc., is extremely hazardous. The value of Segl's pamphlet to future editors of *Anab.* IV. lies not in the certainty or even probability of his detailed itinerary (which goes northwards to beyond Olti and then follows the Chorokh to near Baiburt), but in his useful résumé of earlier solutions, his collection of geographical data, and his sensible estimate of what 10,000 average human beings, carrying packs and escorting a baggage train, could accomplish in an Armenian winter.

W. M. CALDER.

The Manuscript-Tradition of Pseudo-Plutarch's VITAE DECEM ORATORVM. By CLARENCE GEORGE LOWE. One vol. Pp. 53. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1924. \$1.00. This essay is Vol. IX., No. 4, of the *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, one of the best series produced by American scholarship. It is much to be hoped that the ultimate result of this and J. B. Titchener's¹ studies will be a really satisfactory edition of the *Moralia*; at all events, they provide most useful material for the future editor. Mr. Lowe has studied the thirteen MSS. which contain the *Vitae decem oratorum*, also the Aldine edition, and comes to the following conclusions: All, save the fragmentary P1 (Paris. 1957, s. XI.), are of the Planudean recension, and all, even P1, go back to a common archetype, as, indeed, all MSS. of the *Moralia* ultimately do. Of the Planudean codices, M (Ambros. C. 126 inf., s. XIII.) is the oldest, and all the rest are derived, directly or indirectly, from A (Paris. 1671, s. XIII.), which is itself derived from M. This includes even E (Paris. 1672, s. XIV.), the excellence of whose text is due, not to any independent tradition, but simply to good and intelligent editing. The independent value of the Aldine is *nil*. As these views are supported by lists of all noteworthy variants, the result of Mr. Lowe's own collation of the MSS. (from photographs), it may be said that at least we know where we are with regard to this text much more fully than before. H. J. ROSE.

Essai critique sur la Syntaxe de l'Empereur Julien. Remarques critiques sur le Texte de l'Empereur Julien. Par F. BOULENGER. (Mémoires et Travaux des Facultés catholiques de Lille, fascicules XXII., XXIII.) Pp. xxii+265; x+75. Facultés catholiques de Lille. Paris: A. Picard, 1922. Paper, 25 and 8 francs.

DR. BOULENGER deserves well of students for the patient industry with which he has made this minute study of Julian's syntax. At the moment we have not enough trustworthy mono-

graphs of this nature, and, as a result, any investigation of fourth-century Greek as a whole is hardly possible. The present work aims at giving a picture of Julian's syntax as a whole, and not merely of its peculiarities: its utility is increased by a full index. It may be suggested that the author would have done well to make use of W. Schmid's work *Der Atticismus*. His conclusion (p. 238) is reasonable: 'Julien, attique par formation, moderne par nécessité, céda autant qu'homme de son temps au mouvement de la civilisation.'

In the second treatise, Dr. Boulenger states his view of the relationships of the MSS. and makes a number of detailed suggestions, which deserve consideration as coming from one familiar with Julian's language: p. 10A <σε> σερμύστερον (p. 14), p. 14A κατακτησάμενος (p. 15), p. 19B μναις-δέκα (p. 15), p. 162A τῶν for τῆς (p. 33), p. 168D ἐστὶ <ἐστῆ> τὸ (p. 35), p. 175D ἡ καὶ καλῶν (p. 35), to quote but a few examples, are all probable. Both works should be of considerable service to future editors of Julian.

A. D. NOCK.

Le Gymnasiarque des Métropoles de l'Égypte romaine. Par B. A. VAN GRONINGEN. One vol. Pp. viii+164. Groningen: P. Noordhoff, 1924. Fl. 4.50; bound, Fl. 5.50.

THIS is an excellent and very welcome piece of work on a subject which, though one of detail, is of considerable importance for a study of Graeco-Roman Egypt. For the gymnasium was the most typical expression of the life of the Greek settlers, and its head, the gymnasiarch, was under the Romans the principal magistrate, the head of the κοινὸν of ἄρχοντες, in the nome capitals (it is with these only, not with the Greek πόλεις, that the author deals). References to the magistracy and its holders are numerous in the papyri, but they are often no more than references, and the number of doubtful or disputed points is surprisingly large. The author goes minutely into the various problems, and though at times a little too ingenious, he states the evidence fairly and can always give reasons for his conclusions. He has produced a most valuable piece of work, for which papyrologists will be grateful to him; and if the book is sometimes rather laborious reading that is hardly to be wondered at, given the necessity of dealing judiciously with evidence often so fragmentary and ambiguous. That the author can write vigorously and with clarity is shown by his summary survey in the last chapter.

H. I. BELL.

The Writers of Rome. By J. WIGHT DUFF. The World's Manuals. Oxford: University Press. 2s. 6d. net.

THIS is a very good book. It belongs to a series of introductory volumes intended not only for the regular student, but also for the general reader. It is a beginner's book in the sense that it assumes no knowledge of the subject. There is scarcely a word of Latin in it. But it tells so much in little more than a hundred pages, and tells it so well, that many who are familiar with the writers of Rome will read it with satisfaction. Professor Wight Duff

¹ See C.R., 1925, p. 89.

has an intimate knowledge of Latin literature. His *Literary History of Rome* [to the death of Augustus] was published in 1909. Since then he has treated the same subject in *The World's Great Books* and in *Harmsworth's Universal Encyclopaedia*. In the book before us he brings the story down to 117 A.D. He shows good judgment in the selection and treatment of his topics, and he is always interesting. He obviously enjoys reading the works of which he writes, and he succeeds in communicating his pleasure to others. He is very successful in sketching the characteristics of the different authors and their writings, and his translations, admirable in their variety, are very helpful in giving an idea of the quality of their work.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

Iterum. A Further Discussion of the Roman Fate. By W. E. HEITLAND, M.A. 60 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1925. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

AN unfortunate review of *The Roman Fate*, which accused Mr. Heitland of completely misunderstanding the Roman Empire, has stimulated him to work out in more detail his criticisms of the early centuries of the Principate, a period which he refuses to follow most writers in regarding as a golden age. He holds that even then the seeds of decay were present, and that, in particular, the municipal system 'contained from the first germs of a deadly disease.' He explains the favourable verdict which has usually been passed on it by pointing

out that the evidence is one-sided, is concerned almost entirely with town life, and throws little light on the condition of the peasantry, although 'the basic industry of the empire was the exploitation of the soil by the labour of a subject population, whether slave or free.' He draws a close parallel between republican Rome and the municipal towns of the Principate; in both cases agriculture decayed under the rule of an oligarchy, and the interests of the peasantry were sacrificed to those of that oligarchy and the urban proletariat which it controlled. The very independence enjoyed by the municipalities fostered corruption, for the central government could not intervene effectively without shouldering responsibilities which it sought to avoid. The direct evidence on which Mr. Heitland bases his gloomy picture is, as he admits, small in quantity, and concerns only one of the five categories of provincial land which he enumerates—the land included in the *territoria* of municipalities. But he is not alone in finding, at least as early as the Antonine Age, anticipations of the agricultural serfage which is such a well-known feature of the last days of the Roman Empire, and he is right in drawing attention to the hostility with which the country-bred soldiers of the third century regarded the municipalities. The cumulative effect of the points which he makes is considerable, and should do something to modify the rather uncritical admiration of the early Principate which is too common at the present time.

G. H. STEVENSON.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

ON January 31, 1924, Dr. P. Giles read a paper entitled 'New Light on the Relations between Early Greece and the Hittite Civilisation,' summarised *Camb. Univ. Reporter*, March 4; *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 1924, pp. 1-5.

On February 14 Mr. C. T. Seltsman read a paper entitled 'Herodotus and the Athenian Decadrachm,' *Camb. Univ. Rep.*, March 11; *Proc.*, pp. 5 ff.; substance in *Athens: Its History and Coinage*, pp. 105 ff., in extenso.

Mr. J. M. Edmonds followed with a paper entitled 'A Sidelight on the Aeolic Declension,' *Camb. Univ. Rep.*, March 11; *Proc.*, pp. 7 f.

On February 28 Professor A. C. Pearson read a paper entitled 'Pindarica,' *Proc.*, p. 8 f.; printed in full *C.Q.* XVIII. (1924), pp. 151-7.

Mr. J. D. Duff read a note on 'Horace, *Epistles* I. 6. 39,' *Proc.*, pp. 9 ff.; printed *C.R.*, 1924, p. 151.

On May 8 Professor R. S. Conway discussed 'The Sources of the text of Livy's Third Decade,' *Camb. Univ. Rep.*, May 20; *Proc.*, pp. 11 f. He argued that the Medicean (Laur. plut. 63. 2c) had not been copied from the Reginensis or the Colbertinus, and showed probably direct access to the Puteanus. He further showed that the report given by Luchs of the Medicean (his λ) is inadequate.

On October 23 Professor Sir William Ridgeway read a paper entitled 'Niall of the Nine Hostages in connexion with the Treasures of

Traprain Law and Ballinrees and the destruction of Wroxeter, Chester, Caerleon, and Caerwent,' *Camb. Univ. Rep.*, November 18; *Proc.*, pp. 13-27; in full in *J.R.S.* XIV. (1924), pp. 123-136.

Mr. E. Harrison read papers (1) 'On Pan and Panics'; (2) on Plut. *Crass.* XXXII. 4, 5; (3) on Auson. *Parentalia* XXX. 6, where he would read 'quaeque sine exemplo pro nece (or funere) functa uiri,' referring to Alcestis: *Camb. Univ. Rep.*, November 18; *Proc.*, pp. 26 f. (2) is printed in full in *C.R.* XXXIX., p. 55.

On November 6 Dr. Radin read a paper 'On the Adoption of an Alphabet by an Aboriginal People,' *Camb. Univ. Rep.*, November 25; *Proc.*, pp. 27-34.

Professor A. C. Pearson followed with 'Sophoclea,' *Camb. Univ. Rep.*, November 25; *Proc.*, p. 34. His paper has been printed in *C.R.* XXXIX., pp. 2 ff.

On November 20 Mr. D. S. Robertson read a paper on Pindar, *Camb. Univ. Rep.*, December 9; *Proc.*, p. 35. He urged that the Second Pythian was written in 468; that in *Ol.* VI. 14 f. *πυραὶ* and *τέλεσθεν*. *Τὸν* should be read, with a comma after *μάρψεν*; and that in *Ol.* XIII. 113 f. the stop should be omitted after *ἰδμεν*, and *καλά*, followed by a stop, read for *ἀλλά*.

Mr. B. F. C. Atkinson followed with 'The Veneti and their Dialect,' *Camb. Univ. Rep.*, December 9; *Proc.*, pp. 36-45.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

HILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(FEBRUARY-JUNE, 1925.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—E. Schwartz, *Die Odyssee* [München, 1924. Hueber. Pp. vi+342] (Aly). Careful analysis on basis of which S. traces successive stages of construction of the epic; only method that promises sure results. Very important.

HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.—A. Köster, *Das antike Seewesen* [Berlin, 1923, Schoetz u. Parrhysius. Pp. 254 + 104 illustrations] (Assmann). Important addition to nautical literature by an experienced archaeologist and keeper at the Berlin Museum.—E. Weiss, *Griechisches Privatrecht auf rechtsvergleichender Grundlage. I.: Allgemeine Lehren* [Leipzig, 1923, Meiner. Pp. xii + 556] (Ehrenberg). Enormous collection of material drawn from inscriptions, papyri, and literary sources; a mine of information for research.—U. Wilcken, *Griechische Geschichte im Rahmen der Altertumsgeschichte* [München, 1924, Oldenbourg. Pp. vi+246] (Enzlin). Everyone interested in history will gladly follow a leader so well-informed as W. Importance not only of Greek politics, but also of Greek civilisation stressed; covers period from earliest times to 30 B.C.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.—S. Ranulf, *Der eleatische Satz vom Widerspruch* [Copenhagen, 1924, Gyldendalske Boghandel. Pp. 224] (Wallies). Both in length and in content much above average Ph.D. dissertation. Reviewer objects to title, and would call it 'Logik der absoluten Vieldeutigkeit der Begriffe.'—M. Hiestand, *Das Sokratische Nichtwissen in Platons ersten Dialogen* [Zürich, 1923, Seldwyla. Pp. 110] (Nestle). Examines how far the earliest dialogues reflect Socrates' teaching, and what is Plato's own contribution. Fresh and penetrating.—H. Oppermann, *Zeus Panamarios* [Giessen, 1924, Töpelmann. Pp. viii+94] (Latte). Deals chiefly with cult of Zeus at Panamara. Careful work based on (partly unpublished) epigraphical evidence.—J. Stenzel, *Zahl und Gestalt bei Platon und Aristoteles* [Leipzig, 1924, Teubner. Pp. viii+144] (Nestle). Fascinating and finely thought out exposition; important for knowledge of Plato's later philosophy.—H. v. Arnim, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der aristotelischen Politik* [Ak. d. Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungs-

ber. 200. Bd., I. Abhandlung. Wien, 1924, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky. Pp. 130] (Wallies). Penetrating and thorough examination of the many difficulties; nearly half devoted to Bk. III.; distinguishes four component parts of different periods fitted together by an editor.—C. Ritter, *Platon. Sein Leben, seine Schriften, seine Lehre. Bd. II.* [München, 1923, Beck. Pp. xv+910] (Aly). Completes R.'s great work on Plato, the first volume of which appeared in 1910. For R. Plato is an experience, and he writes with real enthusiasm.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—Th. Wiegand, *Achter vorläufiger Bericht über die von den staatlichen Museen in Milet und Didyma unternommenen Ausgrabungen* [Abh. d. Preuss. Ak. d. Wiss. 1924, Phil.-Hist. Klasse Nr. 1. Berlin, 1924. 9 plates and 11 figures] (P. Herrmann). Account of excavations from 1910 to 1913. Much new and partly very important material, especially the small temple once containing statue of Apollo by Kanachos.—F. Poulsen, *Delphische Studien* [Kgl. Danske Vidensk. Selskab, Hist.-fil. Meddelelser, VIII. 5. Copenhagen, 1924, Høst. Pp. 82+28 plates] (Karo). First and more important half deals with 'Apollo and Asia,' the relations of Delphic oracle with the East; second half contains notes on the archaic sculptures at Delphi.

NUMISMATICS.—W. Giesecke, *Sicilia Numismatica. Die Grundlagen des griechischen Münzwesens auf Sizilien* [Leipzig, 1923, Hiersemann. Pp. 188 folio+27 plates and 3 figures] (Laum). Very useful monograph, well illustrated, with promise of something larger to follow.

LANGUAGE.—J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch, und Deutsch. II. Reihe* [Basel, 1924, Birkhäuser. Pp. vi+338] (Reiter). Discusses gender, noun and adjective, pronoun, article, prepositions, and negatives. Careful indices. Arresting from beginning to end.

LEXICOGRAPHY.—F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten. I. Lieferung (a-δίκη)* [Heidelberg, 1924, Selbstverlag] (Bilabel). Arrangement clear and practical; on the whole thoroughly reliable.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,—Professor Housman in the May-June issue of your *Review* (p. 79) tells us that the MS. reading in Soph. *O.T.* 794-6 can only be defended by mistranslation; that neither of

Jebb's renderings is possible; that the true reading is *ρεκαποτίμενος*, because 'the very words of Sophocles are borrowed by Libanius,' and therefore the phrase found in Libanius contains the very words of Sophocles!

It may be my 'British ignorance' which

makes me disagree wholly with Professor Housman. But one cannot argue with a mere dogmatic assertion. It would be helpful if Professor Housman would (1) translate the passage with the reading *ρεκαρούμενος*, (2) explain why either of Jebb's renderings is inadmissible, (3) suggest a reason for the supposed corruption, and (4) tell us how he knows that the words found in Libanius are the very words of Sophocles.

A. W. MAIR.

SIRS.—No, it would not be helpful. If Professor Mair asks such questions and makes such statements after reading what I wrote, he would still ask and make them after reading what I do not intend to write.

I am conscious that this is the tone which would be adopted by some scholars, whom I could name, if they knew that they were wrong and did not want to confess it; but it ought to be understood by this time that I am not of that brood.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

Abhandlungen zur antiken Rechtsgeschichte. Festschrift für Gustav Hanausek. Pp. vii + 159. Graz: Ulr. Mosers Buchhandlung, 1925. Stiff paper, 7s.

Beasley (J. D.) Attische Vasenmaler des rothfigurigen Stils. Pp. xii + 612. Tübingen: Mohr, 1925. Broschiert, M. 21; gebunden, M. 24.50.

Bonus (A. R.) Where Hannibal passed. Pp. 88, with 12 illustrations and a map. London: Methuen, 1925. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Bryan (W. R.) Italic Hut Urns and Hut Urn Cemeteries. A study in the Early Iron Age of Latium and Etruria. Pp. xiv + 204; 25 illustrations. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. IV.) Rome: American Academy, 1925. Cloth, \$2.50.

Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Bude. No. 8. Juillet, 1925.

Butler (H. E.) The Close of the Second Punic War, being Livy, books xxix., xxx., partly in the original and partly in translation, edited by H. E. B. Pp. 182. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

Classical Philology. Vol. XX., No. 3. July, 1925.

Cocchia (E.) La letteratura latina anteriore all' influenza ellenica. Part III. Pp. xi + 397. Napoli: Rondinella and Loffredo, 1925.

Croiset (M.) Démosthène. Harangues. Tome II. Texte établi et traduit par M. C. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. Paper, 20 fr.

Diehl (E.) Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres. Fasc. 6. Pp. xiii, 401-488. Berlin: Weidmann, 1925. Geheftet, M. 5.25. (Price of Vol. I.: geh. M. 24, geb. M. 30.)

Dingswall (E. J.) Male Infibulation. Pp. vii + 145; frontispiece and 7 figures. London: John Bale, Sons and Danielsson, 1925. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Dornseiff (F.) Das Alphabet in Mystik und

Magie. Zweite Auflage. Pp. 195. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1925. (ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ, Heft VII.) Geheftet, G.-M. 8; gebunden, G.-M. 10.

Ernout (A.) et Robin (L.) Lucrèce. De Rerum Natura. Commentaire exégétique et critique, précédé d'une introduction sur l'art de Lucrèce et d'une traduction des lettres et pensées d'Épicure. Tome premier. Livres I. et II. Pp. cxxiii + 371. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. Paper, 25 fr.

Foord (E.) The Last Age of Roman Britain. Pp. 294; maps and illustrations. London: Harrap, 1925. Cloth, 15s. net.

Frank (T.) Roman Buildings of the Republic. An attempt to date them from their materials. Pp. 149; 15 illustrations. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. III.) Rome: American Academy, 1924. Cloth, \$2.50.

Geissler (P.) Chronologie der altattischen Komödie. Pp. 86. (Philologische Untersuchungen, 30. Heft.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1925. Geheftet, M. 4.

Gercke (A.) and Norden (E.) Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft. I. Band. 10. Heft. Lateinische Epigraphik von H. Dessau, Lateinische Paläographie von P. Lehmann. Pp. 68. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1925. Kartoniert, G.-M. 2.80.

Goelzer (H.) Tacite. Annales. Livres XIII.-XVI. Tome III. Texte établi et traduit par H. G. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. Paper, 16 fr.

Goelzer (H.) Virgile. Bucoliques. Texte établi et traduit par H. G. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' Paper, 9 fr.

Hamilton (D. E.) and Carlisle (J. O.) Latin Reader for Secondary Schools. Pp. viii + 319; illustrations. London: Harrap, 1925. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

- Heinze* (R.) Von den Ursachen der Grösse Roms. Zweiter Abdruck. Pp. 39. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1925. Kartoniert, G.-M. 1.80.
- Hoernle* (E. S.) Choric songs from Aeschylus, selected from the Persians, the Seven against Thebes, and Prometheus Bound, with a translation in English rhythm. Pp. 87. Oxford: Blackwell, 1925. Boards, 5s. net.
- Klotz* (A.) C. Iulius Caesar. Commentarii. II. Commentarii Belli Civilis. Editio minor. Pp. 139. (Bibliotheca Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1925. Geheftet, G.-M. 1; gebunden, G.-M. 1.50.
- Kuiper* (T.) Philodemus over den Dood, Pp. xvi + 165. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1925. Stiff paper.
- Kynaston* (H.) Euripides' Alcestis translated by H. K., with introduction and notes by J. Churton Collins. Pp. xxxii + 44. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Paper, 1s. net.
- Lanciani* (R.) Ancient and Modern Rome. Pp. ix + 169. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London: Harrap. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Laum* (B.) Das Eisengeld der Spartaner. Pp. 55. Braunsberg (Ostpreussen): Verlag der staatlichen Akademie, 1925. Paper.
- Litteris*. Vol. II. No. 2. September, 1925.
- Lord* (L. E.) Aristophanes. His plays and his influence. Pp. xi + 183. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London: Harrap. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Lucas* (F. L.) Euripides' Medea, translated, with introduction and notes, by F. L. L. Pp. 92. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924. Paper, 1s. net.
- McArthur* (W.) Latin Lyrics, with measured music, selected and arranged by W. M. Pp. 46. London: Jonathan Cape, 1925. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Margoliouth* (D. S.) The colophons of the Iliad and the Odyssey deciphered by D. S. M., with a reply to some criticisms of Herr v. Wilamowitz Möllendorf. Pp. 21. Oxford: Blackwell, 1925. Paper, 1s.
- Mazon* (P.) Éschyle. Tome II. Agamemnon, Les Choéphores, Les Euménides. Texte établi et traduit par P. M. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. Paper, 20 fr.
- Meyer* (Ernst) Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der ersten Ptolemäer auf Grund der Papyri. Pp. viii + 90. (Zweites Beiheft zum Archiv für Papyrusforschung.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1925. Geheftet, G.-M. 6.
- Moberly* (C. E.) The Commentaries of Julius Caesar on the Civil War. Edited by C. E. M. New illustrated edition, with an introduction by H. Last. Pp. 1 + 227 + vocabulary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Cloth, 5s. (also in 2 parts, 3s. each).
- Moussier*. Rivista di Antichità. Anno II. Fascicolo IV. 1925.
- Nairn* (J. A.) Latin Prose Composition. Pp. xi + 168. Cambridge: University Press, 1925. Cloth, 6s.
- Natale Solum*. Carmen praemio aureo donatum in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano. Accedunt duo carmina laudata. Pp. 18 + 26 + 11. Amsterdam: Academia Regia Discipularum Nederlandica, 1925. Paper.
- Paine* (W. L.) and *Mainwaring* (C. L.) Lingua latina. Primus annus. Second edition. Pp. 176. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Cloth, 3s. net.
- Phillimore* (J. S.) The Silver Latin Book. Part I. From the death of Augustus to the end of the second generation. Pp. xv + 233. Glasgow: Alex. Stenhouse, 1925. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Photiadhes* (P. S.) Ἡ ἀποκρίσις ἐν τῷ ἀρχαίῳ Ἑλληνικῷ δικαίῳ. Pp. 55. Athens: Sakellarios, 1925. Paper.
- Polheim* (K.) Die Lateinische Reimprosa. Pp. xx + 539. Berlin: Weidmann, 1925. Paper, M. 27.
- Postgate* (J. P.) On Ancient Greek Accentuation. Pp. 52. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XI.) London: Milford. Paper, 5s. net.
- Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*. Vol. XXXVII. Section C. No. 1, Louis C. Purser, 'Classical Inscriptions at Shanganagh Castle, Co. Dublin.' Pp. 1-35, 10 plates. No. 2, Olive Purser, 'Ancient Pottery at Shanganagh Castle, Co. Dublin.' Pp. 36-52, 4 plates. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co. 1925.
- Reid* (J. S.) M. Tulli Ciceronis De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum Libri I., II. Edited by J. S. R. Pp. viii + 239. Cambridge: University Press, 1925. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Robinson* (R. P.) C. Suetonii Tranquilli de Grammaticis et Rhetoribus. Edidit apparatus critico instruxit R. P. R. Pp. ix + 80. Paris: Champion, 1925. Stiff paper.
- Roussel* (P.) Délos. Pp. 45, 8 planches. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. Paper, 5 fr.
- Scott* (J. A.) Homer and his Influence. Pp. vii + 169. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London: Harrap. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Sheppard* (J. T.) Euripides Hecuba, translated, with introduction and notes. Pp. 70. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Paper, 1s. net.
- Stewart* (E. M.) The Annals of Quintus Ennius. Pp. xi + 246. Cambridge: University Press, 1925. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Stocks* (J. L.) Aristotelianism. Pp. vii + 165. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London: Harrap. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Terzaghi* (N.) Eroda. I Mimiambi. Introduzione e Traduzione di N. T. Pp. 100. Turin: Paravia.
- Terzaghi* (N.) Eroda. I Mimiambi. Testo critico e commento per cura di N. T. Pp. viii + 200. Turin: Chiantore, 1925.
- The American Journal of Philology*. Vol. XLVI. 3. Whole No. 183. July, August, September, 1925.
- Whitelaw* (R.) Sophocles' Antigone, translated by R. W. With introduction and notes by J. Churton Collins. Pp. 1 + 56. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Paper, 1s. net.
- Winbolt* (S. E.) The Roman Villa at Bignor, Sussex. Its mosaic pavements described, with a plan of the villa. Pp. 15. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Paper, 1s. net.

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- Aeschylus, *Agam.* (1148), 148
aidōs in Hesiod, on, 147
aidōs, the, of Phaedra, and the meaning of the *Hippolytus*, 102
Allbutt (Clifford), notice of Jones's *The Doctor's Oath*, 139
Allen's Homer: the Origins and the Transmission, noticed, 71
Anderson (W.B.), notice of Galletier's *Étude sur la Poésie funéraire romaine d'après les Inscriptions*, 204; notice of Rand's *A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's Letters*, 203
Annual of the British School at Athens, noticed, 120
'Ανταδόσεις and *'Αντιρρησις* in the 'Phaedo', 12
Apollonius Rhodius III. (616-832), 115
Arcadian League, the, and Aristodemus, 104
Arnold (E. V.), notice of Wenley's *Stoicism and its Influence*, 91
Ashby (T.), notice of Showerman's *Eternal Rome*, 130
'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία, notes on the, 152
Atkinson (D.), notice of Mattingly and Sydenham's *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, 84
Augustan Restoration, the, 60
Autran's Introduction à l'Étude critique du Nom propre grec, noticed, 186
Bacon's The Voyage of the Argonauts, noticed, 88
Balbilla, the epigrams of, 107
Barber (E. A.), notice of Knox's *The First Greek Anthologist*, 28; notice of Pfeiffer's *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta*, 29; notice of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, 189
Baynes (Norman H.), notice of Dunlap's *The Office of the Grand Chamberlain in the later Roman and Byzantine Empires*, 92; notice of Stavenhagen's *Herodianus*, 43
Bell (H. I.), notice of Van Groningen's *Le Gymnasiarque des Métropoles de l'Égypte romaine*, 211
Bell's The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction, noticed, 36
BOOKS RECEIVED: 47, 95, 142, 214
Bosanquet (E. C.), notice of Xanthoudides' *The Vaulted Tombs of Mesara*, 119
Boulenger's Essai critique sur la Syntaxe de l'Empereur Julien, *Remarques critiques sur le Texte de l'Empereur Julien*, noticed, 211
Brenot's Phèdre: Fables, noticed, 83
Broadhead (H. D.), Cicero, *De Oratore*, I. (225), 117 (cf. 175)
Brooks' Our Debt to Greece and Rome: Architecture, noticed, 122
Burckhardt's Spuren der Athenischen Volksrede in der alten Komödie, noticed, 87
Burk's Die Pädagogik des Sokrates, noticed, 210
Burnet (John), notice of Snell's *Die Ausdrücke für den Begriff des Wissens in der vorplatonischen Philosophie*, 126
Burnet's Aristotle, noticed, 90
Butler and Cary's M. Tulli Ciceronis de provinciis consularibus oratio ad senatum, noticed, 44
Butler (H. E.), notice of Colson's *Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria*, 35
Calder (W. M.), the Royal Road in Herodotus, 7; notice of Segl's *Vom Kentrites bis Trapezus*, 210
Callander (T.), notice of Grant's *The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable*, 196
Callimachus, Epig. (XXI.), 176
CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY, The, Vol. II., noticed, 20
CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY, Proceedings of the, 212
Campbell's Horace: A New Interpretation, noticed, 33
cantica of Plautus, the, 55
Carcopino's La Louve du Capitole, noticed, 139
Cary (M.), notice of Smith's *The Administration of Justice from Hesiod to Solon*, 87
Casson (C.), 'Υπεράκριοι and Διάκριοι, 5 (cf. 155)
Catullus LXXII. (3, sq.), 19
Charlesworth (M. P.), 'Deus noster Caesar,' 113
Cicero, an echo of, in Horace, 71
Cicero, De Oratore, I. (225), 117 (cf. 175)
Colson (F. H.), Quintilian, the Gospels and Christianity, 166
Colson's Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria, Book I, noticed, 35
Conway (R. S.), notice of *Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum*, 81
Cookson's Cicero the Advocate, noticed, 43
Cornford (F. M.), notice of Taylor's *Platonism and its Influence*, 186
Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum, noticed, 81
CORRESPONDENCE: 46, 95, 142, 213
Cuntz's Die Geographie des Ptolemaeus, noticed, 195
Curl's The Treasure of Trajann, noticed, 85
Dahms' Ilias und Achilleis, noticed, 74
Davies (Gilbert A.), Callimachus, *Epig.* (XXI.), 176
De Falco's L'Epiparodo nella Tragedia Greca, noticed, 87
Delatte's La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce, noticed, 30
'Deus noster Caesar,' 113
Diakrioi and Hyperakrioi, 155
Didot Rhesis, the, 117
Diehl's Anthologia Lyrica, noticed, 182; *Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres*, noticed, 206
Diels' Lukrez von der Natur, noticed, 198
Diels' Platon: Oeuvres Complètes: Le Sophiste, noticed, 209
Dittmer's The Fragments of Athenian Comic Didascaliae found in Rome, noticed, 87
Dodds (E. E.), the *aidōs* of Phaedra and the meaning of the *Hippolytus*, 102
Dodds' Select Passages illustrative of Neoplatonism, noticed, 91
Doherty's The Martyrdom of Socrates, noticed, 43
Dornseiff's Pindars Stil, noticed, 209
Dream of Herodas, the, 13
Duff (J. D.), Version, 98; notice of Diels' *Lukrez von der Natur*, 198; notice of Rouse's *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura* (Loeb Classical Library), 198
Duff (J. Wight), notice of Bell's *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction*, 36; notice of Brenot's *Phèdre: Fables*, 83; notice of Harrington's *Catullus and his Influence*, 89

Duff's (J. Wight) *The Writers of Rome*, noticed, 211
 Dnababin (B. L.), notes on Latin authors, 111
 Dunlap's *The Office of the Grand Chamberlain in the later Roman and Byzantine Empires*, noticed, 92
 Duval's *Les Morts Malfaisants*, noticed, 90
 EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS, I, 49, 97
 Edmonds (J. M.), notice of Robinson's *Sappho and Her Influence*, 194; the epigrams of Balbilla, 107
 Eustratiades and Arcadius' *Harvard Theological Studies* XI, noticed, 139
 Farquhar (J. N.), notice of Monahan's *The Early History of Bengal*, 140
 Fell's *Etruria and Rome*, noticed, 31
flexipes and *flexibilis*, 70
 'Fons et Origo,' 71
 Fraser (J.), notice of Autran's *Introduction à l'Étude critique du Nom propre grec*, 186; notice of Walker's *Three Inscriptions from Crete*, 207
 Galletier's *Étude sur la Poésie funéraire romaine d'après les Inscriptions*, noticed, 204
 Gaselee (Stephen), notice of Sedgwick's *The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius*, 132
 Gaselee's *An Anthology of Medieval Latin*, noticed, 138
 genealogy of Arete and Alkinoos, the, 145
 Gercke and Norden's *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, noticed, 23
 Giannelli's *La Spedizione di Serse da Terme a Salamina*, noticed, 208
 Gillies (M. M.), Apollonius Rhodius III. (616-832), 115; notice of Bacon's *The Voyage of the Argonauts*, 88
 Glover's *Herodotus*, noticed, 80
 Godley (A. D.), notice of Campbell's *Horace: a New Interpretation*, 33; notice of Torr's *Hannibal crosses the Alps*, 32
 Gomme (A. W.), notice of Hoyland's *A Brief History of Civilisation*, 137; notice of Ormerod's *Piracy in the Ancient World*, 127; notice of *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 120; notice of *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Vol. II.), 20; notice of Vaughan's *Great Peoples of the Ancient World*, 137; notes on the 'Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, 152; Theognis (959-962), 101
 Gow (A. S. F.), notice of Pfuhl's *Meisterwerke Griechischer Zeichnung und Malerei*, 44
 Granger (F.), Vitruvius' definition of architecture, 67
 Grant's *The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable*, noticed, 196
 Hackforth (R.), 'Ἀνταπόδοσις and Ἀνύμνησις in the 'Phaedo,' 12; notice of *Philosophical Essays presented to John Watson*, 26
 Halliday (W. R.), notice of Moore's *The Religious Thought of the Greeks*, 183; notice of Nilsson's *A History of Greek Religion*, 183; notice of Rose's *The Roman Questions of Plutarch*, 128
 Harmon's *Lucian*, Vol. IV. (Loeb Classical Library), noticed, 193
 Harrington's *Catullus and his Influence*, noticed, 89
 Harrison (E.), notice of Gercke and Norden's *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, 23; Plutarch, Crassus XXXII. (4, 5), 55; notice of Rudberg's *Kring Platons Phaidros*, 210; notice of Zimmermann's *The Greek Commonwealth*, 208
 Heath (T. L.), notice of Delatte's *La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce*, 30
 Heitland's *Itrurum. A Further Discussion of the Roman Fate*, noticed, 212
 Heraeus' *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri*, noticed, 199
 Herodas, the Dream of, 13
 Hesiod, on certain words in, 98
 Hopfner's *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae* (IV.), noticed, 91
 Housman (A. E.), notice of Heraeus' *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri*, 199; notice of Pearson's *Sophoclis fabulae*, 76 (cf. 214)

How (W. W.), notice of Giannelli's *La Spedizione di Serse da Terme a Salamina*, 208
 Hoyland's *A Brief History of Civilisation*, noticed, 137
 Hudson-Williams (T.), notice of Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica*, 182
 In *Mnemosynen Quinquagenariam*, 50
 Jachmann's *Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum*, noticed, 197
 Jaeger (Werner), notice of Ross's *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, 176
 James' *Our Hellenic Heritage* (II. iv.), noticed, 87
 Jespersen's *The Philosophy of Grammar*, noticed, 38
 Jones (H. Stuart), notice of Curle's *The Treasure of Traprain*, 85
 Jones' *The Doctor's Oath*, noticed, 139
 Kerkidas Papyrus, the (II.), 50
 Knox (A. D.), notice of Powell's *Collectanea Alexandrina*, 190; the Dream of Herodas, 13; The Kerkidas Papyrus (II.), 50
 Knox's *The First Greek Anthologist*, noticed, 28
 Král's *Beiträge zur griechischen Metrik*, noticed, 208
 Kromayer's *Antike Schlachtfelder*, noticed, 24
 Kunst's *Plantus: Aulularia*, noticed, 197; *Rhetorische Papyri* (Berliner Klassikertexte, Heft VII.), noticed, 139
 La Piana's *Ricostruzione Mitrica e Ritmica dei Canti Lirici nelle Tragedie Greche*, noticed, 209
 Lamb (W. R. M.), notice of Diès' *Platon: Oeuvres Complètes* (Tome VIII.; *Le Sophiste*), 209
 Lamb's *Plato*, Vol. IV. (Loeb Classical Library), noticed, 127
 Latin authors, notes on, 111
 lex Gabinia, the so-called, 15
 Lindsay's *T. Macci Planti Captivi*, noticed, 89
 λόγος and λογιόργη, 176
 Lowe's *The Manuscript Tradition of Pseudo-Plutarch's Vitae decem oratorum*, noticed, 211
 Lucas' *Euripides and his Influence*, noticed, 43
 Lydian words in the *Anthology* and *Hesychius*, 159
 Mackail (J. W.), notice of Postgate's *Pervigilium Veneris*, 41
 Mattingly and Sydenham's *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, noticed, 84
 Marshall (F. H.), notice of Wilson's *The Roman Toga*, 131
 Mavrogardato (John), on Sophocles, *Antigone* (909 ff.), 151
 McKenzie (R.), notice of van der Velde's *Thessalische Dialektgeographie*, 88; notice of Vendryes' *Language*, 88
 Meyer's *Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*, noticed, 140
 Milne (H. J. M.), notice of Kunst's *Rhetorische Papyri* (Berliner Klassikertexte, Heft VII.), 139; notice of Meyer's *Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*, 140; the Didot Rhesis, 117
 Milne's *Junior Latin Unseen*, noticed, 44
 Minns (E. H.), notice of Eustratiades and Arcadius' *Harvard Theological Studies*, XI, 139
 Monahan's *The Early History of Bengal*, noticed, 140
 Moore's *The Religious Thought of the Greeks*, noticed, 183
 More's *Hellenistic Philosophies*, noticed, 91
 Mother Goddess, the, 173
 Munro (J. A. E.), notice of Kromayer's *Antike Schlachtfelder*, 24
 Murray (G.), notice of Allen's *Homer: the Origins and the Transmission*, 71
 Murray's *Rise of the Greek Epic*, noticed, 73
 Mustard (W. P.), 'Fons et Origo,' 71
 Neill (S. C.), notice of Dodd's *Select Passages illustrative of Neoplatonism*, 91
 Newhall's *The Lyric Portions of Iphigenia in Aulis and Iphigenia among the Taurians*, noticed, 194
 Nicomachean Ethics, notes on the text of the, 157

- Nilsson's *A History of Greek Religion*, noticed, 183
- Noek (A. D.), the Augustan Restoration, 60; the Mother Goddess, 173; Theocritus II, (38), 18; notice of Boulenger's *Essai critique sur la Syntaxe de l'Empereur Julien*, Remarques critiques sur le Texte de l'Empereur Julien, 211; notice of Burk's *Die Pädagogik des Isokrates*, 210; notice of Diehl's *Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres*, 206; notice of Dornseiff's *Pindars Stil*, 209
- Norwood's *The Art of Terence*, noticed, 40
- O'Brien-Moore's *Madness in Ancient Literature*, noticed, 208
- Ormerod (H. A.), the so-called Lex Gabinia, 15
- Ormerod's *Piracy in the Ancient World*, noticed, 127
- Ovid, *Metamorphosis*, viii, (16), 160
- Owen (A. S.), notice of Harmon's *Lucian: Vol. IV.* (Loeb Classical Library), 193
- OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY, 140
- Pantini (W. E. P.), notice of Butler and Cary's *M. Tulli Cicero's de provinciis consularibus*, 44; notice of Cookson's *Cicero the Advocate*, 43; notice of Doherty's *The Martyrdom of Socrates*, ib.; notice of Milne's *Junior Latin Unscams*, 44; notice of Westaway's *Selections from Plautus*, ib.; notice of Wight Duff's *The Writers of Rome*, 211
- Parmentier and Grégoire's *Euripide* (Budé), Tomes III., IV., noticed, 180
- Pearson (A. G.), notes on the 'Trachiniae', 2; notice of Král's *Beiträge zur griechischen Metrik*, 208; notice of La Piana's *Ricostruzione Metrica e Ritmica del Canto Lirico nelle Tragedie Greche*, 209; notice of the Budé *Euripide* (Tomes III., IV.), 180
- Pearson's *Sophocles fabulae*, noticed, 76
- Peet (T. Eric), notice of Fell's *Etruria and Rome*, 31; notice of Hopfner's *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae*, 91
- Petronius, notes on, 117
- Pfeiffer's *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta*, noticed, 29
- Pfuhl's *Meisterwerke Griechischer Zeichnung und Malerei*, noticed, 44
- Phillimore (J. S.), Terence, *Hecyra* (Prol. 2), 18; notice of Jachmann's *Die Geschichte des Terentextes im Altertum*, 197; notice of Kunst's *Plautus: Aulularia*, 197; notice of Norwood's *The Art of Terence*, 40
- Philosophical Essays presented to John Watson, noticed, 26
- Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.), notice of Burckhardt's *Spuren der Athenischen Volksrede in der alten Komödie*, 87; notice of de Falco's *L'Epiparodo nella Tragedia Greca*, 87; notice of Dittmer's *The Fragments of Athenian Comic Didascaliae found in Rome*, 87; notice of Lucas' *Euripides and his Influence*, 43
- Platzner (M.), on Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* (1148), 148; *Theocritea*, 149
- Plutarch, *Crassus* XXXII. (4, 5), 55
- Pocock (L. G.), *Supplicatio quindecim dierum*, 18
- Postgate (J. P.) notice of Smith's *A Plain Guide to Greek Accentuation*, 87; the pure iambic trimeter, 161
- Postgate's (J. P.) *A Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek*, noticed, 195
- Postgate's (R. W.) *Perigillum Veneris*, noticed, 41
- Powell's *Collectanea Alexandrina*, noticed, 190
- 'programme' coin-types of Antoninus Pius, some, 170
- Propertius III, 2, 20, a note on, 19
- pure Iambic Trimeter, the, 161
- Quintilian, the Gospels and Christianity, 166; the Gospels and Comedy, 17
- Rackham (H.), notes on the text of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, 157; notice of Webster's *Meteorologica* (Works of Aristotle translated into English, 27
- Rand's *A New Approach to the Text of Pliny's Letters*, noticed, 203
- Roberts (W. Rhys), *λόγος and λογιότης*, 176
- Robertson (D. S.), notice of Brooks' *Our Debt to Greece and Rome: Architecture*, 124; notice of E. and R. Wurz's *Die Entstehung der Säulenbasen des Altertums*, 208; notice of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Menander: Das Schiedsgericht* (Epitrepontes), 188
- Robinson (E. S. G.), notice of Seltman's *Athens*, 124
- Robinson's *Sappho and Her Influence*, noticed, 194
- Robson (E. T.), *Vervactum, veteretum*, 69
- Roemer's *Die Homerexegese Aristarchs*, noticed, 75
- Rose (H. J.), Quintilian, the Gospels and Comedy, 17; *Varia*, 175; notice of Carcopino's *La Louve du Capitole*, 139; notice of Duval's *Les Morts Mal-faisants*, 90; notice of Lowe's *The Manuscript Tradition of Pseudo-Plutarch's VITAE DECIM ORATORUM*, 211; notice of Scott's *Hermetica*, 133; notice of Titchener's *The MS. Tradition of Plutarch's Actia*, 89
- Rose's *The Roman Questions of Plutarch*, noticed, 128
- Rosa (W. D.), notice of *Satura Berolinensis*, 138
- Ross's *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, noticed, 176
- Rouse's *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura* (Loeb Classical Library), noticed, 198
- royal road in Herodotus, the, 7
- Rudberg's *Kring Platons Phaidros*, noticed, 210
- Sargeant (G. M.), note on Propertius III, 2, (20), 19
- Satura Berolinensis, noticed, 138
- Sayce (A. H.), Lydian words in the *Anthology* and *Hesychius*, 159
- Scott's *Hermetica*, noticed, 133
- Sedgwick (W. B.), notes on Petronius, 117; the *Cantica* of Plautus, 55; the composition of the *Stichus*, 59
- Sedgwick's *The Cena Trimalchionis* of Petronius, noticed, 132
- Segl's *Vom Kentrites bis Trapezus*, noticed, 210
- Seltman's *Athens: Its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion*, noticed, 124
- Sheppard (J. T.), notice of Murray's *Rise of the Greek Epic*, 73; notice of Newhall's *The Lyric Portions of Iphigenia in Aulis and Iphigenia among the Taurians*, 194; notice of O'Brien-Moore's *Madness in Ancient Literature*, 208; notice of Stanley's *Greek Themes in Modern Musical Settings*, 194
- Shewan (A.), notice of Dahms' *Ilias und Achilleis*, 74; notice of Roemer's *Die Homerexegese Aristarchs*, 75; the genealogy of Arete and Alkinoos, 146
- Showerman's *Eternal Rome*, noticed, 130
- Sinclair (T. A.), on *αἶώς* in Hesiod, 147; on certain words in Hesiod, 98
- Slater (D. A.), *flexipes* and *flexibilis*, 70; Ovid, *Metamorphosis*, VIII. (16), 161
- Smith's (F. D.) *A Plain Guide to Greek Accentuation*, noticed, 88
- Smith's (G.) *The Administration of Justice from Hesiod to Solon*, noticed, 87
- Snell's *Die Ausdrücke für den Begriff des Wissens in der vorplatonischen Philosophie*, noticed, 126
- Sonnenschein (E. A.), notice of Jespersen's *The Philosophy of Grammar*, 38
- Souter (A.), notice of Gaselee's *An Anthology of Medieval Latin*, 138; notice of Welldon's *S. Aurelii Augustini . . . de Civitate Dei*, 135
- Stählin's *Das Hellenische Thessalien*, noticed, 137
- Stanley's *Greek Themes in Modern Musical Settings*, noticed, 194
- Stavenhagen's *Herodians*, noticed, 43
- Stevenson (G. H.), notice of Heitland's *Iterum*, 212
- Stichus*, the composition of the, 59
- Stocks (J. L.), notice of Burnet's *Aristotle*, 90; notice of More's *Hellenistic Philosophies*, 91; notice of Theiler's *Zur Geschichte der teleologischen Naturbeobachtung bis auf Aristoteles*, 210
- Sturtevant (E. H.), notice of Postgate's *A Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek*, 195
- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 45, 93, 140, 213

Supplicatio quindecim dierum, 18
Tarn (W. W.), the Arcadian League and Aristodemos, 104
Tarrant (Dorothy), Catullus LXXII. (3 sq.), 19
Tate (J.), Virgil, *Aeneid* V. (830 sq.), 71
Tatham (M. T.), an echo of Cicero in Horace, 71
 Taylor's Platonism and its Influence, noticed, 186
 Terence, *Hecyra* (Prol. 2), 18
 Theiler's *Zur Geschichte der teleologischen Naturbetrachtung bis auf Aristoteles*, noticed, 210
 Theocritea, 149
 Theocritus II. (38), 18
 Theognis (959-962), 101
Thomson (J. A. K.), notice of James' *Our Hellenic Heritage*, 87
Thomson (J. O.), notice of Cuntz's *Die Geographie des Ptolemaeus*, 195
 Titchener's *The MS. Tradition of Plutarch's Aetia*, noticed, 89
 Torr's *Hannibal Crosses the Alps*, noticed, 32
Toynbee (Jocelyn), some 'programme' coin-types of Antoninus Pius, 170
 'Trachiniae' notes on the, 2
 'Τρεπάρκιοι and Δούκριοι, 5 (cf. 155)
Ure (P. N.), Diakrioi and Hyperakrioi, 155
 Van der Velde's *Thessalische Dialektgeographie*, noticed, 88
 Van Groningen's *Le Gymnasiarque des Métropoles de l'Égypte romaine*, noticed, 211
 Varia, 175

Vaughan's *Great Peoples of the Ancient World*, noticed, 137
 Vendryes' *Language: a Linguistic Introduction to History*, noticed, 88
 VERSION: 98
vervactum, veteretum, 69
 Virgil, *Aeneid* V. (830 sq.), 71
 Vitruvius' Definition of Architecture, 67
Wace (A. J. B.), notice of Stählin's *Das Hellenische Thessalien*, 137
 Walker's *Three Inscriptions from Crete*, noticed, 207
 Webster's *Works of Aristotle translated into English: Meteorologica*, noticed, 27
 Welldon's *S. Aurelii Augustini De Civitate Dei . . . libri XXII.*, noticed, 135
 Wells (J.), notice of Glover's *Herodotus*, 80
 Wenley's *Stoicism and its Influence*, noticed, 91
Westaway (K. M.), notice of Lindsay's *T. Macci Plauti Captivi*, 89
 Westaway's *Selections from Plautus*, noticed, 44
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, noticed, 189; *Menander: Das Schiedsgericht (Eptrepontes)*, noticed, 188
 Wilson's *The Roman Toga*, noticed, 131
 Wurz' (Erwin and Reinhold), *Die Entstehung der Säulenbasen des Altertums*, noticed, 208
 Xanthoudides' *The Vaulted Tombs of Mesará*, noticed, 119
 Zimmermann's *The Greek Commonwealth* (Fourth Edition, revised), noticed, 208

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Aeschylus:—*Ag.* (255) 79b; (1146-9) 148. *Sept.* (197) 80b
 Anthology:—VII. (709) 159b
 Apollonius Rhodius:—III. (616-824) 115; (660 f., 782, 832) 116b
 Aristotle:—*Ἀθ. Πολ.* 4 (2), 8 (1), 152a; 12. (5), 153a. *Meteorologica* (342a 3), (344b 31), 27b; (345a 15), (371a 30), 28a; (373b, 377b 17) 28a. *Nic. Eth.* 1096a 18, 1097a 17, 1097b 12, 1098b 4, 1107b 27, ib. 29, 1108a 31 f., 1112a 28 f., 1114a (31), 157a; 115a 23, 115b 11 f., 1115b 28, 1125a (21 f.), 157b; 1134b 28, 110a, 5, 1143a 19, 1144a 21, 1148a 14, 1148b 23, 1149a 13, 1153a 2, 1153a 6, 1156b 3, 1156b (22), 158a; 1158b 4, 116a 24, 1165a 11, 1165b 21, 1166a 25, 1168a (21 ff.), 158b; 1170b 4, 1171a 35, 1172a 9, 1173a 19, 1177a (5), 159b
 Asclepius:—(6) 135a
 Ausonius:—*Parentalia* XXX. (6), 212b
 Bacchylides:—IX. (38), 126b
 Balbilla:—*Efig.* I. (C. I. G. III. 4725) 108b; II. (C. I. G. III. 4730, 4731) 109a; III. (C. I. G. III. 4729) 109b; IV. (C. I. G. III. 4727) 110a
 Callimachus:—*Efig.* XXI. (cl. XIX.) 176. *frag.* (P. Oxy. XV. 1793). 29 f.
 Catullus: IV., XXIX., 161 ff.; LXXII. (3 f.), 19
 Cercidas:—28 f., 50 ff., 191
 Cicero:—*ad Att.* II. (2, 1) 113a; IV. (3) 19a; VI. (8, 4) 113a; X. (18, 1) 113b. *ad Fam.* I. (9, 14, 15) 19a; IX. (25, 3) 110b. *de Invent.* II. (14) 113b. *de Orat.* I. (225) 117, 175b. *de Prov. Cons.* II (28), ib. *pro Balbo* 27 (61) ib.
 Corpus Hermeticum:—I. (7) 134a, (16) 134b; IV. (3), VI. (1), 134a; X. (10) 134b, (14) 134a; XI. (3), 134b; XI. (9), XII. (4) 134a; XII. (8), XIII. (1) 134b; XIV. (1) 134b, (3) 135a, (4, 7) 134b; XVI. (9, 11) 135a
 Euripides:—*Androm.* (1029) 100a. *El.* (170, 272) 181a; (373) 181b. *Hipp.* (73 ff.) 102b; (79 f.) 103b; (198 ff., 239 ff.) 102b; (243) 102b, n.; (244) 102b, 103a; (247 ff.) 102b; (310, 325, 335) 103a; (375 ff.) 102 ff.; (377 ff.) 103b; (384 f., 393 f., 395 f., 400 ff.) 102b; (503 f., 731,

916, 1034f., 1062) 103b; (1128 ff., 1131 ff.) 102b. *Ion* (98, 174, 235, 300, 354) 181b. *Supp.* (599, 769, 876 f., 903, 1101) 181b. *Tro.* (916 ff.) 181b.
 Herodas:—*Mimes* I. 84, II. 5 ff., 14, III. 75, 88, V. 30, VI. 65, VII. (7), 15a; VIII. (18 ff.) 13a; (24 ff., 27, 28, 30, 33, 34 f., 36, 45) 13b; (47, 58, 61, 62, 64, 67 f., 76 ff.) 14a; IX. (2 f., 8), 15b
 Herodotus:—I. (73 ff.) 8a; V. (52) 9b; VII. (26) 9a
 Hesiod:—*Erga* (192 ff.) 147a; (210) 100a; (317 ff.) 147a, 148b; (323 ff.) 147b; (389) 99a; (419) 100b; (500) 148a; (511) 98a; (530) 99a; (590) 100b. *Shield* (173) 100a; (354) 147a; (425) 100a. *Theog.* (92) 147a; (295 ff.) 55a; (423) 100a
 Homer:—*Il.* I. (410) 100a; III. (140) 146a; VI. (17), XVII. (125), XVIII. (302) 100a; XIX. (203 ff.) 146a; XXI. (296), 100a; XXII. (338) 146a; (489) 99b, n.; XXIV. (45) 147a. *Od.* δ (62, 596, 687 ff.) 146a; ε (50) 146b; η (54 ff.) 145 ff.; θ (554) 145b; ι (34) 146a; λ (271) 146b; τ (158) 146a; τ (399 ff.) 145b
 Homeric Hymn:—*To Demeter* (214) 147a
 Horace:—*Carm.* I. 7. (14), II. 2. (23 f.) 111a; II. 16. (2), III. 8. (6) 111b; III. 24 (3 f.) 111a; IV. 12. (6) 111b. *Ep.* I. 6. (19) 111b; 14. (37) 111a; 19 (39 f.), 111b; 20. (7 f.) 112a; II. 1. (256), 71b; 2. (90-105) 111b. *Epod.* XVI., 161 ff.
 Juvenal:—III. (14, cl. VI. 522), 112, 175a; (212, 221), V. (100 f., 141) VIII. (1) 112b; VIII. (49) 113 a; XIV. (97) 175a; XVI. (21) 113a
 Libanius:—*decl.* 12, 11 (Reisk. IV. p. 184) 79a
 Livy:—I. (13) 172a
 Lucian:—*Amores* (44), 55b
 Lucretius:—I. (418, 626) 199b
 Macrobius:—*ad Somn. Scipionis* II. 9. (11), 71b.
 Martial:—I. 48 (6), III. 13 (2), 202a; III. 42 (4), 200a; IV. 31 (10), 202a; 58 (2), 200b; 67 (8), 200a; 86 (8), 112b; VI. 64 (3), 202b; VII. 56 (1), 19b; VIII. 6 (7), 202b; 36 (11), 19b; 45 (4), IX. 44 (3) 202b; 93 (3), 201a; XI. 90 (3), 200b; 100 (4), 203a; XII. 32 (17), 202a; 59 (9), 200b; XIV. 131 (1), 216 (2), 203b; *Spect.* 15 (8), 19 (3), 27 (2), 27 (9), 65 (1), 201a

- Menander:—*Epit.* (261 etc.) 188 f.
 N. T.:—S. Luke VIII. (5 ff.) 17a; S. Mark IV. (3 ff.) *ib.*, 169; S. Matthew XIII. (3 ff.) 17b.
 Ovid:—*Fasti* iv. (305 ff.) 172b; *Met.* viii. (16) 160; x. (99) 70 f.
 Pausanias:—VIII. (10. 5) 106a; (27. 11) *ib.* and 104a; (36. 5) 104a.
 Persius:—V. (63) 17b.
Pervigilium Veneris:—41 ff.
 Petronius:—(33. 3; 35. 4; 37. 4, 10) 117b; (37. 10) 132b; (38. 8, 9) 117b; (41. 6) 118a; (41. 12) 132b; (42. 4) 118a; (43. 8) 132b; (45. 1, 7, 9; 46. 7 f.; 50. 5; 52. 3, 8; 53. 11; 56. 6; 57. 6) 118a; (58. 7) 132a; (59. 2) 118a; (59. 4) 132a; (62. 2; 64. 7) 118a; (64. 12; 68. 8; 69. 9; 70. 1; 73. 3) 118b; (77. 4) 118b, 132b; (77. 6) 118b.
 Phaedrus:—I. i. (5) 83a; iv. (4) 83 b; II. v. (25) 84b.
 Pindar:—*Ol.* vi. (14 f.), xiii. (113 f.), 212b.
 Plato:—*Euthyd.* (p. 93), 77b; *Phaedo* 77B (8), 12b; *Prot.* (321b), 127b.
 Plautus:—*Pseud.* (1321) 160; *Stichus.* (446 ff., 670 f.) 59b; (729 ff.) 59a.
 Plutarch:—*Agis* (3) 104a; *Crassus* XXXII. (4. 5) 55a, b; *de glor. Athen.* (5) 176a; *de liber. educ.* (2b) 17b; *de Virt. Mor.* (8), 102a; *Quaest. Rom.* xxvi. (21) 129.
 Propertius:—III. 2 (20) 19; IV. 10 (31), 203.
 Quintilian:—I. 3 (5), 17, 166b; (16) 167a; 4 (13), 5 (12, 22 f.), 7 (23) 35b.
 Seneca:—*Apocoloc.* (5), 113b; (7), 118b. *Ep.* 73 (16) 17b.
 Silius Italicus:—III. (442 ff.) 32b.
 Sophocles:—*Ajax* (9, 228, 406, 420) 77b; (516) 79a; (551) 77b; (630, 775.) 79a; (802) 77b; (841 f.) 78b; (865) 80b; (878) 77b; (886) 78a; (991) 77b; (1029) 80a; (1032, 1100.) 77b; (1141) 79a; (1226) 80b; (1228) 77b; (1231) 80a; (1268) 77b; (1353) 79a. *Ant.* (126) 79b; (211, 233, 235) 79a; (241, 362) 77b; (368) 79a; (397) 80b; (593) 79a; (674) 78a; (900 ff.) 151 f.; (966) 77b; (1012) 80a; (1247, 1301) 77b. *Electra* (69, 84) 80b; (221) 78a; (554) 80a; (684) 78b; 686, 901, 933, 1107, 1155, 1405) 77b. *O. C.* (220, 380 ff.) 78b; (534 f., 682, 688) 80a; (737 f.) 77b; (1057, 1164) 78a; (1212) 77b; (1455) 80a; (1673) 80b; (1702) 78a. *O. T.* (68, 184) 77b; (199) 80a; (378, 430, 493) 77a; (494) 78a; (525) 79a; (546) 77b; (665 ff.) 78a; (794 ff.) 79a, 213 f.; (943) 78b; (971) 77b; (1050) 77b; (1209) 79b; (1213) 77b; (1219) 79b; (1242) 80b. *Phil.* (40) 77b; (187 f.) 80a; (283) 77b; (334, 343) 80a; (850, 984) 78a; (1078) 80b; (1089), 80a; (1099) 78a; (1192) 77b; (1407) 77b, 78a. *Trachin.* (88) 79a; (156 ff., 169 f.) 2a; (220 f.) 2b, 78a; (265 f.) 2b; (267) 78a; (377 ff., 379), 3a; (394) 3b; (520) 77b; (530 ff.) 80b; (547) 4a; (575) 80b; (654) 78a; (660) 4a; (731) 77b; (744) 80a; (837) 4b, 78a; (854) 80a; (893) 80b; (910 f.) 77b, 78b; (911) 4b; (940) 5b, 77b; (1224) 77b. *frag.* (681 N, 74 P.) 78a.
 Stobaeus:—*Florileg.* II, 23 (Meineke), 135b.
 Strabo:—*Geogr.* XIII. (2) 176a.
 Suidas:—(Bernh. I. p. 813) 79a.
 Tacitus:—*Ann.* XV. (64) 175a; (74) 115 n. 5; XVI. (35) 175a.
 Terence:—*And.* (805) 41a. *Hantont.* (154, 723 ff.) 41b. *Hecyra* *Prolog.* (2) 18. *Maur.* (2397) 41b.
 Theocritus:—*Id.* II. (38) 18; III. (28 ff.) 149a; VI. (6 f.) 149b; XIII. (52) 150a, (69 f.) 150b; XXIV. (11 f., 42 ff.) 150b, (80) 151a; XXV. (163) 30b; *Epigr.* viii. (5 f.) 151a, xxi. (50 f.) 151b.
 Theognis:—(959-962), 101.
 Thucydides:—IV. (25), 6a.
 Virgil: *Aen.* II. (616), IV. (13) V. (830 f.) 71b; VIII. (265 ff.) 171a; IX. (731), 112a.
 Vitruvius:—*de Architect.* I. i (1), 67 ff.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Fetter Lane

London, E.C. 4

The Cambridge Ancient History. Edited by J. B. BURY, M.A., S. A. COOK, Litt.D., and F. E. ADCOCK, M.A. **Vol. III. The Assyrian Empire.** With 15 maps and 6 plans. Royal 8vo. 35s net.

Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion. **Vol. II. Zeus, God of the Dark Sky** By A. B. COOK. With illustrations. Royal 8vo. [Ready Immediately]

Volume I of this treatise dealt with Zeus as god of the Bright Sky. The present volume investigates the common classical conception of Zeus as god of thunder and lightning.

The Hellenistic Age. Aspects of Hellenistic civilization treated by J. B. BURY, Litt.D., F.B.A., E. A. BARBER, M.A., EDWYN BEVAN, D.Litt., LL.D., and W. W. TARN, M.A. **Second edition.** Crown 8vo. 6s net.

"Exceedingly interesting and well written. . . . It is remarkable that a book so close-packed as to make a detailed review impossible should yet be so easy to read."—*The Oxford Magazine*.

Iterum, or a Further Discussion of the Roman Fate. By W. E. HEITLAND, M.A. Demy 8vo. 2s 6d net.
(*The Roman Fate.* By the same author. Demy 8vo. 3s net.)

A Few Words on Verse Translation from Latin Poets. By W. E. HEITLAND, M.A. Fcap 8vo. 2s 6d net.

Cicero. De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum. Libri I, II. Edited by J. S. REID, Litt.D. Demy 8vo. 16s net.

The Annals of Quintus Ennius. Edited by ETHEL MARY STEUART, M.A.(Lond.), D.Litt.(Edin.). Crown 8vo. 7s 6d net.

Although the importance of the Annals of Ennius is universally recognised by students of classical literature, the fragments have not hitherto been edited with English notes.

Latin Prose Composition. By J. A. NAIRN, Litt.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

This book contains 75 pieces for translation from English into Latin, preceded by several introductory chapters on the writing of Latin prose, together with models written in the style not only of Cicero, but also of Cæsar, Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus.

The Helen of Euripides. Translated by J. T. SHEPPARD. Crown 8vo. 2s net

"Mr Sheppard's skill as a verse translator needs no introduction; he turns the choruses into excellent English lyrics, and the dialogue is sometimes in blank verse and sometimes rhymed."—*The Times Literary Supplement*.

By the same author: *The Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles. Demy 8vo. 20s net. Acting edition, 2s net. *The Cyclops* of Euripides. Crown 8vo. 1s net.

MURRAY'S STUDENTS' MANUALS

REVISED EDITIONS

THE STUDENT'S HISTORY OF GREECE

From the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest. With Chapters on the History of Literature and Art. By Sir Wm. Smith, D.C.L., LL.D. A New Edition, thoroughly revised and in part rewritten, by G. E. Marindin, M.A., formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. 9s.

The book has been revised throughout, many of the chapters, particularly in the earlier part, have been entirely, or to a great extent, rewritten, and the book has been provided with new maps and plans, and new illustrations.

THE STUDENT'S HISTORY OF ROME

From the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire. With Chapters on the History of Literature and Art. By Dean Liddell. A New Edition, by P. V. M. Benecke, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford. 9s.

The general form of the book, the selection of topics, and the comparative scale of their treatment remain unaltered. Details have occasionally been added, as well as some notes on the principal ancient and modern authorities; references have been frequently given to passages in standard works where the subjects under discussion are treated at greater length or the grounds set out for the view adopted in the text. Changes have for the most part only been made with the object of expressing Dr. Liddell's opinions in a form in accordance with the result of recent research.

THE STUDENT'S HISTORY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

From its Foundation to the Death of Marcus Aurelius (27 B.C.—A.D. 180). With Coloured Maps and numerous Illustrations. By J. B. Bury, Litt.D., Regius Professor of Modern History at the University of Cambridge. 9s.

This work takes up the History at the point at which Dean Liddell leaves off, and carries it down to the period at which Gibbon begins. It supplies a complete History of the Roman Empire, condensed into the limits of one volume.

THE STUDENT'S GIBBON

A History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Abridged from the Original Work. With Maps and Illustrations. A New and Revised Edition in Two Parts. 6s. each.

Part I.—From the Accession of Commodus to the Death of Justinian. By A. H. J. Greenidge, M.A., late Lecturer and Fellow of Hertford College, and Lecturer in Ancient History at Brasenose College, Oxford.

Part II.—From A.D. 565 to the Capture of Constantinople by the Turks. By J. C. G. Anderson, M.A., late Fellow of Lincoln College, Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford.

The text here presented is very nearly that of the edition of 1876; the changes which have been introduced are mainly in the direction of a restoration to the original form in which it was selected from Gibbon's History.

SMALLER SERIES

A SMALLER HISTORY OF GREECE

From the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest. By Sir Wm. Smith, D.C.L., LL.D. With Coloured Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. A New Edition, thoroughly revised and in part rewritten by G. E. Marindin, M.A. 4s.

A SMALLER HISTORY OF ROME

From the Earliest Times to the Death of Trajan. New and thoroughly Revised Edition by A. H. J. Greenidge, M.A. With a Supplementary Chapter on the Empire to A.D. 117, by G. Middleton, M.A., under the direction of Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A., D.C.L. With Coloured Map, Plans, and Illustrations. 4s.

THE GREATEST STORY IN THE WORLD

By Horace G. Hutchinson, B.A.

Vol. I.—From the Beginning of History to the Dawn of the Christian Era. With Map and Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

Vol. II.—The Further Story of the Old World up to the Discovery of the New. With Map and Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

In Preparation

Vol. III.—The Development of the Modern World. With Map and Illustrations 3s. 6d.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

Facing first page of text

LS

erature
n pari
t, have
ns, and

story of
ow and

atment
ancient
ere the
l in the
iddell's

IRE

l Maps
at the

own to
ndensed

Work.

, M.A.,
asenose

dereson,

ve been
ed from

With
ewritten

A. H. J.
iddleton,
Plans,

Map and
th Map

age of text

THE PLACE-NAMES OF ENGLAND AND WALES

By the Rev. JAMES B. JOHNSTON,
M.A., B.D., Author of "The Place-
Names of Scotland," etc. Medium
8vo. 18s. net.

"It is a very fine attempt of the conspectus of the whole
subject, which has never till now been accomplished, and it
very worthily represents the twenty years of leisure given
to it."—*The Observer*.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

86 CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2.

FROM MR. MURRAY'S LIST

THE MAKING OF LATIN

By R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., Professor of Latin in the University of Man-
chester; Hon. Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Crown
8vo. 5s. net.

NEW STUDIES OF A GREAT INHERITANCE.

Being Lectures on the Modern Worth of some Ancient Authors.
By R. S. CONWAY, F.B.A., Litt.D., Professor of Latin in the University of
Manchester; Hon. Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
7s. 6d. net.

AN ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF MODERN ENGLISH

By ERNEST WEEKLEY, M.A., Author of "The Romance of Words,"
"Surnames," etc. Cheaper Edition. Large Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

The "Concise" edition of Professor Ernest Weekley's "Etymological Dictionary of
Modern English" puts the latest results of etymological research within the reach of
the most modern purses. The abridgment has not involved any diminution in the vocabu-
lary; in fact, many new words such as *copee*, *fascist*, *insulin*, *rodeo*, etc. are here registered
for the first time. The reduction in bulk has been effected by brevity of explanation.

An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English. By ERNEST WEEKLEY,
M.A. Crown 4to. £2 2s. net.

THE ROMANCE OF WORDS

Large Crown 8vo. Fourth Impression. 6s. net.

"A book of extraordinary interest; everyone interested in words should immediately obtain a copy, and those who
do not yet realize how enthralling a subject word-history is, could not do better than sample its flavour in
Mr. Weekley's admirable book."—*Observer*.

THE ROMANCE OF NAMES

Large Crown 8vo. Fourth Edition. 6s. net.

"Professor Weekley is one of those rare teachers who know how to make learning interesting. We welcomed his
book on 'The Romance of Words,' and we are equally glad to have its companion 'The Romance of Names,' which
is at once entertaining and scholarly. It does not make the mistake of giving us too much."—*Athenaeum*.

SURNAMES

Large Crown 8vo. Second Edition. 6s. net.

"Mr. Weekley has so artfully sprinkled his pages with odd and impossible names that we simply cannot help
reading him."—*The Times*

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

Some Oxford Books

THE CLARENDON LATIN AND GREEK SERIES

Partly in the original and partly in translation

General Editor: R. W. LIVINGSTONE

Crown 8vo., cloth; with introductions, notes and vocabularies

Price 3s. 6d. net each except where stated

- AESCHYLUS, *PERSAE*. Edited by M. R. Ridley.
APULEIUS, *CUPID & PSYCHE*. Edited by H. E. Butler.
ARISTOPHANES, *CLOUDS*. Edited by Cyril Bailey.
CAESAR, *CIVIL WAR*, I-II. Edited by H. N. P. Sloman.
CAESAR, *CIVIL WAR*, III. Edited by W. C. Compton, H. M. Last, and C. E. Freeman.
CAESAR, *GALLIC WAR*, IV (20-38) and V. Edited by R. W. Livingstone and C. E. Freeman. 2s. 6d. net.
CAESAR, *GALLIC WAR*, VI-VII. Edited by the same. 2s. 6d. net.
*CICERO THE ADVOCATE, being Cicero, *Pro Milone* and *Pro Murena*. Edited by C. Cookson.
THE CATILINARIAN CONSPIRACY from Sallust and Cicero. Edited by H. E. Butler.
*EURIPIDES, *THE MEDEA*. Edited by F. L. Lucas.
*EURIPIDES, *HECUBA*. Edited by J. T. Sheppard.
HERODOTUS, *BOOK VII*. Edited by C. E. Robinson and others.
*LIVY, *BOOKS XXI-XXII*. 'Hannibal's Invasion of Italy.' Edited by John Jackson.
*LIVY, *XXIX-XXX*. 'The Close of the Second Punic War.' Edited by H. E. Butler.
SALLUST, *THE JUGURTHINE WAR*. Edited by H. E. Butler.
*THE MARTYRDOM OF SOCRATES. Selections from the *Apology*, *Crito*, and *Phaedo*. Edited by F. C. Doherty.
VIRGIL, *AENEID*, I-III. Edited by C. E. Freeman and Cyril Bailey.
VIRGIL, *AENEID*, IV-VI. Edited by Cyril Alington.
*VIRGIL, *AENEID*, VII-IX. Edited by R. A. Knox.
*VIRGIL, *THE GEORGICS*. Edited by John Sargeant and Thomas Fletcher Royds.

* The latest volumes in the series.

THE CLARENDON TRANSLATIONS

In paper covers, 1s. net. The following have been issued:

- EURIPIDES' *ALCESTIS*. By H. Kynaston.
EURIPIDES' *HECUBA*. By J. T. Sheppard.
EURIPIDES' *MEDEA*. By F. L. Lucas.
SOPHOCLES' *ANTIGONE*. By R. Whitelaw and J. C. Collins.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

